
## **EXHIBIT A**



## SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA-WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2007-9:30 A.M.

THE COURT: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YOU HAVE BEEN

SELECTED TO SIT ON THE GRAND JURY. IF YOU'LL STAND AND RAISE

YOUR RIGHT HAND, PLEASE.

MR. HAMRICK: DO YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, SOLEMNLY
SWEAR OR AFFIRM THAT YOU SHALL DILIGENTLY INQUIRE INTO AND
MAKE TRUE PRESENTMENT OR INDICTMENT OF ALL MATTERS AND THINGS
AS SHALL BE GIVEN TO YOU IN CHARGE OR OTHERWISE COME TO YOUR
KNOWLEDGE TOUCHING YOUR GRAND JURY SERVICE; TO KEEP SECRET THE
COUNSEL OF THE UNITED STATES, YOUR FELLOWS AND YOURSELVES; NOT
TO PRESENT OR INDICT ANY PERSON THROUGH HATRED, MALICE OR ILL
WILL; NOR LEAVE ANY PERSON UNREPRESENTED OR UNINDICTED THROUGH
FEAR, FAVOR, OR AFFECTION, NOR FOR ANY REWARD, OR HOPE OR
PROMISE THEREOF; BUT IN ALL YOUR PRESENTMENTS AND INDICTMENTS
TO PRESENT THE TRUTH, THE WHOLE TRUTH, AND NOTHING BUT THE
TRUTH, TO THE BEST OF YOUR SKILL AND UNDERSTANDING?

IF SO, ANSWER, "I DO."

(ALL GRAND JURORS ANSWER AFFIRMATIVELY)

THE COURT: ALL JURORS HAVE TAKEN THE OATH AND ANSWERED AFFIRMATIVELY.

IF YOU'LL HAVE A SEAT. WE ARE NEARLY COMPLETED WITH THIS PROCESS.

I AM OBLIGATED BY THE CONVENTION OF THE COURT AND THE LAW OF THE UNITED STATES TO GIVE YOU A FURTHER CHARGE REGARDING YOUR RESPONSIBILITY AS GRAND JURORS. THIS WILL

2.4

APPLY NOT ONLY TO THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN SWORN, BUT THE REST OF
YOU WHOSE NAMES HAVE NOT YET BEEN CALLED, YOU ARE GOING TO BE
PUT IN RESERVE FOR US.

AND IF DISABILITIES OCCUR -- I DON'T MEAN IN A

PHYSICAL SENSE, BUT PEOPLE MOVE OR SITUATIONS COME UP WHERE

SOME OF THE FOLKS THAT HAVE BEEN SWORN IN TODAY ARE RELIEVED,

YOU WILL BE CALLED AS REPLACEMENT GRAND JURORS. SO THESE

INSTRUCTIONS APPLY TO ALL WHO ARE ASSEMBLED HERE TODAY.

NOW THAT YOU HAVE BEEN IMPANELED AND SWORN AS A GRAND JURY, IT'S THE COURT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INSTRUCT YOU ON THE LAW WHICH GOVERNS YOUR ACTIONS AND YOUR DELIBERATIONS AS GRAND JURORS.

THE FRAMERS OF OUR FEDERAL CONSTITUTION DETERMINED AND DEEMED THE GRAND JURY SO IMPORTANT TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE THAT THEY INCLUDED A PROVISION FOR THE GRAND JURY IN OUR BILL OF RIGHTS.

AS I SAID BEFORE, THE 5TH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION PROVIDES, IN PART, THAT NO PERSON SHALL BE HELD TO ANSWER FOR A CAPITAL OR OTHERWISE INFAMOUS CRIME WITHOUT ACTION BY THE GRAND JURY.

WHAT THAT MEANS IN A VERY REAL SENSE IS YOU'RE THE BUFFER BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT'S POWER TO CHARGE SOMEONE WITH A CRIME AND THAT CASE GOING FORWARD OR NOT GOING FORWARD.

THE FUNCTION OF THE GRAND JURY, IN FEDERAL COURT AT LEAST, IS TO DETERMINE PROBABLE CAUSE. THAT'S THE SIMPLE

FORMULATION THAT I MENTIONED TO A NUMBER OF YOU DURING THE

JURY SELECTION PROCESS. PROBABLE CAUSE IS JUST AN ANALYSIS OF

WHETHER A CRIME WAS COMMITTED AND THERE'S A REASONABLE BASIS

TO BELIEVE THAT AND WHETHER A CERTAIN PERSON IS ASSOCIATED

WITH THE COMMISSION OF THAT CRIME, COMMITTED IT OR HELPED

COMMIT IT.

IF THE ANSWER IS YES, THEN AS GRAND JURORS YOUR
FUNCTION IS TO FIND THAT THE PROBABLE CAUSE IS THERE, THAT THE
CASE HAS BEEN SUBSTANTIATED, AND IT SHOULD MOVE FORWARD. IF
CONSCIENTIOUSLY, AFTER LISTENING TO THE EVIDENCE, YOU SAY "NO,
I CAN'T FORM A REASONABLE BELIEF EITHER THAT A CRIME WAS
COMMITTED OR THAT THIS PERSON HAS ANYTHING TO DO WITH IT, THEN
YOUR OBLIGATION, OF COURSE, WOULD BE TO DECLINE TO INDICT, TO
TURN THE CASE AWAY AND NOT HAVE IT GO FORWARD.

A GRAND JURY CONSISTS OF 23 MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY DRAWN AT RANDOM. I'VE USED THE TERM "INFAMOUS CRIME." AN INFAMOUS CRIME, UNDER OUR LAW, REFERS TO A SERIOUS CRIME WHICH CAN BE PUNISHED BY IMPRISONMENT BY MORE THAN ONE YEAR. THE PROSECUTORS WILL PRESENT FELONY CASES TO THE GRAND JURY.

MISDEMEANORS, UNDER FEDERAL LAW, THEY HAVE DISCRETION TO CHARGE ON THEIR OWN. AND THEY'RE NOT -- THOSE CHARGES -- MISDEMEANORS AREN'T ENTITLED TO PRESENTMENT BEFORE A GRAND JURY.

BUT ANY CASE THAT CARRIES A PENALTY OF A YEAR OR

MORE MUST BE PRESENTED TO -- ACTUALLY, MORE THAN A YEAR. A

YEAR AND A DAY OR LONGER MUST BE PRESENTED TO A GRAND JURY.

THE PURPOSE OF THE GRAND JURY, AS I MENTIONED, IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THERE'S SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO JUSTIFY A FORMAL ACCUSATION AGAINST A PERSON.

IF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS -- AND I DON'T MEAN
THIS IN A DISPARAGING WAY. BUT IF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS,
INCLUDING AGENTS AS WELL AS THE FOLKS THAT STAFF THE U.S.
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, WERE NOT REQUIRED TO SUBMIT CHARGES TO AN
IMPARTIAL GRAND JURY TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE EVIDENCE WAS
SUFFICIENT, THEN OFFICIALS IN OUR COUNTRY WOULD BE FREE TO
ARREST AND BRING ANYONE TO TRIAL NO MATTER HOW LITTLE EVIDENCE
EXISTED TO SUPPORT THE CHARGE. WE DON'T WANT THAT. WE DON'T
WANT THAT.

WE WANT THE BURDEN OF THE TRIAL TO BE JUSTIFIED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, EVIDENCE THAT CONVINCES YOU OF PROBABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE THAT A CRIME PROBABLY OCCURRED AND THE PERSON IS PROBABLY RESPONSIBLE.

NOW, AGAIN, I MAKE THE DISTINCTION YOU DON'T HAVE TO VOTE ON ULTIMATE OUTCOMES. THAT'S NOT UP TO YOU. YOU CAN BE ASSURED THAT IN EACH CASE, YOU INDICT THE PERSON WHO WILL BE ENTITLED TO A FULL SET OF RIGHTS AND THAT THERE WILL BE A JURY TRIAL IF THE PERSON ELECTS ONE. THE JURY WILL HAVE TO PASS ON THE ACCUSATION ONCE AGAIN USING A MUCH HIGHER STANDARD OF PROOF, PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.

AS MEMBERS OF THE GRAND JURY, YOU, IN A VERY REAL

2.4

2.4

SENSE, STAND BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE ACCUSED. IT'S
YOUR DUTY TO SEE THAT INDICTMENTS ARE RETURNED ONLY AGAINST
THOSE WHOM YOU FIND PROBABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE ARE GUILTY AND
TO SEE TO IT THAT THE INNOCENT ARE NOT COMPELLED TO GO TO
TRIAL OR EVEN COMPELLED TO FACE AN ACCUSATION.

IF A MEMBER OF THE GRAND JURY IS RELATED BY BLOOD OR MARRIAGE OR KNOWS OR SOCIALIZES TO SUCH AN EXTENT AS TO FIND HIMSELF OR HERSELF IN A BIASED STATE OF MIND AS TO THE PERSON UNDER INVESTIGATION OR ALTERNATIVELY YOU SHOULD FIND YOURSELF BIASED FOR ANY REASON, THEN THAT PERSON SHOULD NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE INVESTIGATION UNDER QUESTION OR RETURN THE INDICTMENT.

ONE OF OUR GRAND JURORS, MS. GARFIELD, HAS RELATIVES
THAT -- OBVIOUSLY, MS. GARFIELD, IF YOUR SON OR YOUR HUSBAND
WAS EVER CALLED IN FRONT OF THE GRAND JURY, THAT WOULD BE A
CASE WHERE YOU WOULD SAY, "THIS IS JUST TOO CLOSE. I'M GOING
TO RECUSE MYSELF FROM THIS PARTICULAR CASE. NO ONE WOULD
IMAGINE THAT I COULD BE ABSOLUTELY IMPARTIAL WHEN IT COMES TO
MY OWN BLOOD RELATIVES."

SO THOSE ARE THE KINDS OF SITUATIONS THAT I REFER TO WHEN I TALK ABOUT EXCUSING YOURSELF FROM A PARTICULAR GRAND JURY DELIBERATION. IF THAT HAPPENS, YOU SHOULD INDICATE TO THE FOREPERSON OF THE GRAND JURY, WITHOUT GOING INTO DETAIL, FOR WHATEVER REASON, THAT YOU WANT TO BE EXCUSED FROM GRAND JURY DELIBERATIONS ON A PARTICULAR CASE OR CONSIDERATION OF A

PARTICULAR MATTER IN WHICH YOU FEEL YOU'RE BIASED OR YOU MAY HAVE A CONFLICT.

THIS DOES NOT MEAN THAT IF YOU HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY,
YOU SHOULD NOT PARTICIPATE IN AN INVESTIGATION. HOWEVER, IT
DOES MEAN THAT IF YOU HAVE A FIXED STATE OF MIND BEFORE YOU
HEAR EVIDENCE EITHER ON THE BASIS OF FRIENDSHIP OR BECAUSE YOU
HATE SOMEBODY OR HAVE SIMILAR MOTIVATION, THEN YOU SHOULD STEP
ASIDE AND NOT PARTICIPATE IN THAT PARTICULAR GRAND JURY
INVESTIGATION AND IN VOTING ON THE PROPOSED INDICTMENT. THIS
IS WHAT I MEANT WHEN I TALKED TO YOU ABOUT BEING FAIR-MINDED.

ALTHOUGH THE GRAND JURY HAS EXTENSIVE POWERS, THEY'RE LIMITED IN SOME IMPORTANT RESPECTS.

FIRST, THESE ARE THE LIMITATIONS ON YOUR SERVICE:
YOU CAN ONLY INVESTIGATE CONDUCT THAT VIOLATES THE FEDERAL
CRIMINAL LAWS. THAT'S YOUR CHARGE AS FEDERAL GRAND JURORS, TO
LOOK AT VIOLATIONS OR SUSPECTED VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL
LAW.

YOU ARE A FEDERAL GRAND JURY, AND CRIMINAL ACTIVITY WHICH VIOLATES STATE LAW, THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, IS OUTSIDE OF YOUR INQUIRY. IT MAY HAPPEN AND FREQUENTLY DOES HAPPEN THAT SOME OF THE CONDUCT THAT'S UNDER INVESTIGATION BY THE FEDERAL GRAND JURY ALSO VIOLATES STATE LAW. AND THIS IS FINE. THAT'S PROPER. BUT THERE ALWAYS HAS TO BE SOME FEDERAL CONNECTION TO WHAT IS UNDER INVESTIGATION OR YOU HAVE NO JURISDICTION.

2.4

THERE'S ALSO A GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATION ON THE SCOPE OF YOUR INQUIRES AND THE EXERCISE OF YOUR POWERS. YOU MAY INQUIRE ONLY INTO FEDERAL OFFENSES COMMITTED IN OUR FEDERAL DISTRICT, WHICH INCLUDES SAN DIEGO AND IMPERIAL COUNTIES; THAT IS, THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

YOU MAY HAVE CASES THAT IMPLICATE ACTIVITIES IN
OTHER AREAS, OTHER DISTRICTS, AND THERE MAY BE SOME EVIDENCE
OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY IN CONJUNCTION WITH WHAT GOES ON HERE
THAT'S ALSO HAPPENING ELSEWHERE. THERE ALWAYS HAS TO BE A
CONNECTION TO OUR DISTRICT.

THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES, WE HAVE 93 DISTRICTS

NOW. THE STATES ARE CUT UP LIKE PIECES OF PIE, AND EACH

DISTRICT IS SEPARATELY DENOMINATED, AND EACH DISTRICT HAS

RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR OWN COUNTIES AND GEOGRAPHY. AND YOU,

TOO, ARE BOUND BY THAT LIMITATION.

I'VE GONE OVER THIS WITH A COUPLE OF PEOPLE. YOU
UNDERSTOOD FROM THE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS THAT A COUPLE OF
PEOPLE WERE EXCUSED, I THINK THREE IN THIS CASE, BECAUSE THEY
COULD NOT ADHERE TO THE PRINCIPLE THAT I'M ABOUT TO TELL YOU.

BUT IT'S NOT FOR YOU TO JUDGE THE WISDOM OF THE CRIMINAL LAWS ENACTED BY CONGRESS; THAT IS, WHETHER OR NOT THERE SHOULD BE A FEDERAL LAW OR SHOULD NOT BE A FEDERAL LAW DESIGNATING CERTAIN ACTIVITY IS CRIMINAL IS NOT UP TO YOU. THAT'S A JUDGMENT THAT CONGRESS MAKES.

AND IF YOU DISAGREE WITH THAT JUDGMENT MADE BY

2.4

CONGRESS, THEN YOUR OPTION IS NOT TO SAY "WELL, I'M GOING TO VOTE AGAINST INDICTING EVEN THOUGH I THINK THAT THE EVIDENCE IS SUFFICIENT" OR "I'M GOING TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF EVEN THOUGH THE EVIDENCE MAY BE INSUFFICIENT." INSTEAD, YOUR OBLIGATION IS TO CONTACT YOUR CONGRESSMAN OR ADVOCATE FOR A CHANGE IN THE LAWS, BUT NOT TO BRING YOUR PERSONAL DEFINITION OF WHAT THE LAW OUGHT TO BE AND TRY TO IMPOSE THAT THROUGH APPLYING IT IN A GRAND JURY SETTING.

FURTHERMORE, WHEN YOU'RE DECIDING WHETHER TO INDICT
OR NOT TO INDICT, YOU SHOULDN'T BE CONCERNED WITH PUNISHMENT
THAT ATTACHES TO THE CHARGE. I THINK I ALSO ALLUDED TO THIS
IN THE CONVERSATION WITH ONE GENTLEMAN. JUDGES ALONE
DETERMINE PUNISHMENT. WE TELL TRIAL JURIES IN CRIMINAL CASES
THAT THEY'RE NOT TO BE CONCERNED WITH THE MATTER OF PUNISHMENT
EITHER. YOUR OBLIGATION AT THE END OF THE DAY IS TO MAKE A
BUSINESS-LIKE DECISION ON FACTS AND APPLY THOSE FACTS TO THE
LAW AS IT'S EXPLAINED AND READ TO YOU.

THE CASES WHICH YOU'LL APPEAR WILL COME BEFORE YOU
IN VARIOUS WAYS. FREQUENTLY, PEOPLE ARE ARRESTED DURING OR
SHORTLY AFTER THE COMMISSION OF AN ALLEGED CRIME. AND THEN
THEY'RE TAKEN BEFORE A MAGISTRATE JUDGE, WHO HOLDS A
PRELIMINARY HEARING TO DETERMINE WHETHER INITIALLY THERE'S
PROBABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE A PERSON'S COMMITTED A CRIME.

ONCE THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE FINDS PROBABLE CAUSE, HE
OR SHE WILL DIRECT THAT THE ACCUSED PERSON BE HELD FOR ACTION

BY THE GRAND JURY. REMEMBER, UNDER OUR SYSTEM AND THE 5TH AMENDMENT, TRIALS OF SERIOUS AND INFAMOUS CRIMES CAN ONLY PROCEED WITH GRAND JURY ACTION. SO THE DETERMINATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE IS JUST TO HOLD THE PERSON UNTIL THE GRAND JURY CAN ACT. IT TAKES YOUR ACTION AS A GRAND JURY BEFORE THE CASE CAN FORMALLY GO FORWARD. IT'S AT THAT POINT THAT YOU'LL BE CALLED UPON TO CONSIDER WHETHER AN INDICTMENT SHOULD BE RETURNED IN A GIVEN CASE.

STATES ATTORNEY OR AN ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY BEFORE
AN ARREST IS MADE. BUT DURING THE COURSE OF AN INVESTIGATION
OR AFTER AN INVESTIGATION HAS BEEN CONDUCTED, THERE'S TWO WAYS
THAT CASES GENERALLY ENTER THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROCESS: THE
REACTIVE OFFENSES WHERE, AS THE NAME IMPLIES, THE POLICE REACT
TO A CRIME AND ARREST SOMEBODY. AND THOSE CASES WILL THEN BE
SUBMITTED TO YOU AFTER MUCH OF THE FACTS ARE KNOWN. AND THEN
THERE'S PROACTIVE CASES, CASES WHERE MAYBE THERE'S A SUSPICION
OR A HUNCH OF WRONGDOING. THE FBI MAY BE CALLED UPON TO
INVESTIGATE OR SOME OTHER FEDERAL AGENCY, AND THEY MAY NEED
THE ASSISTANCE OF THE GRAND JURY IN FACILITATING THAT
INVESTIGATION.

THE GRAND JURY HAS BROAD INVESTIGATORY POWERS. YOU HAVE THE POWER TO ISSUE SUBPOENAS, FOR EXAMPLE, FOR RECORDS OR FOR PEOPLE TO APPEAR. SOMETIMES IT HAPPENS THAT PEOPLE SAY "I DON'T HAVE TO TALK TO YOU" TO THE FBI, AND THEY REFUSE TO TALK

2.4

2.4

TO THE AUTHORITIES. UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES, ON OCCASION,
THE FBI MAY GO TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY AND SAY, "LOOK, YOU NEED
TO FIND OUT WHAT HAPPENED HERE. SUMMON THIS PERSON IN FRONT
OF THE GRAND JURY." SO IT MAY BE THAT YOU'RE CALLED UPON TO
EVALUATE WHETHER A CRIME OCCURRED AND WHETHER THERE OUGHT TO
BE AN INDICTMENT. YOU, IN A VERY REAL SENSE, ARE PART OF THE
INVESTIGATION.

IT MAY HAPPEN THAT DURING THE COURSE OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO ONE CRIME, IT TURNS OUT THAT THERE IS EVIDENCE OF A DIFFERENT CRIME THAT SURFACES. YOU, AS GRAND JURORS, HAVE A RIGHT TO PURSUE THE NEW CRIME THAT YOU INVESTIGATE, EVEN CALLING NEW WITNESSES AND SEEKING OTHER DOCUMENTS OR PAPERS OR EVIDENCE BE SUBPOENAED.

NOW, IN THAT REGARD, THERE'S A CLOSE ASSOCIATION
BETWEEN THE GRAND JURY AND THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND THE
INVESTIGATIVE AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. UNLIKE THE
U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE OR THOSE INVESTIGATIVE AGENCIES, THE
GRAND JURY DOESN'T HAVE ANY POWER TO EMPLOY INVESTIGATORS OR
TO EXPEND FEDERAL FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATIVE PURPOSES.

INSTEAD, YOU MUST GO BACK TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY AND ASK THAT THOSE THINGS BE DONE. YOU'LL WORK CLOSELY WITH THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE IN YOUR INVESTIGATION OF CASES. IF ONE OR MORE GRAND JURORS WANT TO HEAR ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE ON A CASE OR THINK THAT SOME ASPECT OF THE CASE OUGHT TO BE PURSUED, YOU MAY MAKE THAT REQUEST TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY.

2.4

IF THE U.S. ATTORNEY REFUSES TO ASSIST YOU OR IF YOU BELIEVE THAT THE U.S. ATTORNEY IS NOT ACTING IMPARTIALLY, THEN YOU CAN TAKE THE MATTER UP WITH ME. I'M THE ASSIGNED JURY JUDGE, AND I WILL BE THE LIAISON WITH THE GRAND JURIES.

YOU CAN USE YOUR POWER TO INVESTIGATE EVEN OVER THE ACTIVE OPPOSITION OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY. IF THE MAJORITY OF YOU ON THE GRAND JURY THINK THAT A SUBJECT OUGHT TO BE PURSUED AND THE U.S. ATTORNEY THINKS NOT, THEN YOUR DECISION TRUMPS, AND YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO HAVE THAT INVESTIGATION PURSUED IF YOU BELIEVE IT'S NECESSARY TO DO SO IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE.

I MENTION THESE THINGS TO YOU AS A THEORETICAL POSSIBILITY. THE TRUTH OF THE MATTER IS IN MY EXPERIENCE HERE IN THE OVER 20 YEARS IN THIS COURT, THAT KIND OF TENSION DOES NOT EXIST ON A REGULAR BASIS, THAT I CAN RECALL, BETWEEN THE U.S. ATTORNEY AND GRAND JURIES. THEY GENERALLY WORK TOGETHER. THE U.S. ATTORNEY IS GENERALLY DEFERENTIAL TO THE GRAND JURY AND WHAT THE GRAND JURY WANTS.

IT'S IMPORTANT TO KEEP IN MIND THAT YOU WILL AND DO HAVE AN INVESTIGATORY FUNCTION AND THAT THAT FUNCTION IS PARAMOUNT TO EVEN WHAT THE U.S. ATTORNEY MAY WANT YOU TO DO.

IF YOU, AS I SAID, BELIEVE THAT AN INVESTIGATION

OUGHT TO GO INTO OTHER AREAS BOTH IN TERMS OF SUBJECT MATTER,

BEING A FEDERAL CRIME, AND GEOGRAPHICALLY, THEN YOU AS A GROUP

CAN MAKE THAT DETERMINATION AND DIRECT THE INVESTIGATION THAT

WAY.

2.4

SINCE THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY HAS THE DUTY OF PROSECUTING PERSONS CHARGED WITH THE COMMISSION OF FEDERAL CRIMES, SHE OR ONE OF HER ASSISTANTS -- BY THE WAY, THE U.S. ATTORNEY IN OUR DISTRICT IS MS. CAROL LAM -- SHE OR ONE OF HER ASSISTANTS WILL PRESENT THE MATTERS WHICH THE GOVERNMENT HAS DESIRES TO HAVE YOU CONSIDER. THE ATTORNEY WILL EDUCATE YOU ON THE LAW THAT APPLIES BY READING THE LAW TO YOU OR POINTING IT OUT, THE LAW THAT THE GOVERNMENT BELIEVES WAS VIOLATED. THE ATTORNEY WILL SUBPOENA FOR TESTIMONY BEFORE YOU SUCH WITNESSES AS THE LAWYER THINKS ARE IMPORTANT AND NECESSARY TO ESTABLISH PROBABLE CAUSE AND ALLOW YOU TO DO YOUR FUNCTION, AND ALSO ANY OTHER WITNESSES THAT YOU MAY REQUEST THE ATTORNEY TO CALL IN RELATION TO THE SUBJECT MATTER UNDER INVESTIGATION.

REMEMBER THAT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE GRAND JURY FUNCTION AND THAT OF THE TRIAL JURY IS THAT YOU ARE NOT PRESIDING IN A FULL-BLOWN TRIAL. IN MOST OF THE CASES THAT YOU APPEAR, THE LAWYER FOR THE GOVERNMENT IS NOT GOING TO BRING IN EVERYBODY THAT MIGHT BE BROUGHT IN AT THE TIME OF TRIAL; THAT IS, EVERYBODY THAT HAS SOME RELEVANT EVIDENCE TO OFFER. THEY'RE NOT GOING TO BRING IN EVERYONE WHO CONCEIVABLY COULD SAY SOMETHING THAT MIGHT BEAR ON THE OUTCOME. THEY'RE PROBABLY GOING TO BRING IN A LIMITED NUMBER OF WITNESSES JUST TO ESTABLISH PROBABLE CAUSE. OFTENTIMES, THEY PRESENT A SKELETON CASE. IT'S EFFICIENT. IT'S ALL THAT'S NECESSARY.

IT SAVES TIME AND RESOURCES.

2.4

WHEN YOU ARE PRESENTED WITH A CASE, IT WILL TAKE 16
OF YOUR NUMBER OUT OF THE 23, 16 MEMBERS OF THE GRAND JURY OUT
OF THE 23, TO CONSTITUTE A QUORUM. YOU CAN'T DO BUSINESS
UNLESS THERE'S AT LEAST 16 MEMBERS OF THE GRAND JURY PRESENT
FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ANY BUSINESS. IF FEWER THAN 16 GRAND
JURORS ARE PRESENT EVEN FOR A MOMENT, THEN THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE GRAND JURY MUST STOP. YOU CAN NEVER OPERATE WITHOUT A
OUORUM OF AT LEAST 16 MEMBERS PRESENT.

NOW, THE EVIDENCE THAT YOU WILL HEAR NORMALLY WILL CONSIST OF TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES AND WRITTEN DOCUMENTS. YOU MAY GET PHOTOGRAPHS. THE WITNESSES WILL APPEAR IN FRONT OF YOU SEPARATELY. WHEN A WITNESS FIRST APPEARS BEFORE YOU, THE GRAND JURY FOREPERSON WILL ADMINISTER AN OATH. THE PERSON MUST SWEAR OR AFFIRM TO TELL THE TRUTH. AND AFTER THAT'S BEEN ACCOMPLISHED, THE WITNESS WILL BE QUESTIONED.

ORDINARILY, THE U.S. ATTORNEY PRESIDING AT THE -REPRESENTING THE U.S. GOVERNMENT AT THE GRAND JURY SESSION
WILL ASK THE QUESTIONS FIRST. THEN THE FOREPERSON OF THE
GRAND JURY MAY ASK QUESTIONS, AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE GRAND
JURY MAY ASK QUESTIONS, ALSO.

I USED TO APPEAR IN FRONT OF THE GRAND JURY. I'LL
TELL YOU WHAT I WOULD DO IS FREQUENTLY I'D ASK THE QUESTIONS,
AND THEN I'D SEND THE WITNESS OUT AND ASK THE GRAND JURORS IF
THERE WERE ANY QUESTIONS THEY WANTED ME TO ASK. AND THE

2.4

REASON I DID THAT IS THAT I HAD THE LEGAL TRAINING TO KNOW
WHAT WAS RELEVANT AND WHAT MIGHT BE PREJUDICIAL TO THE
DETERMINATION OF WHETHER THERE WAS PROBABLE CAUSE.

A LOT OF TIMES PEOPLE WILL SAY, "WELL, HAS THIS
PERSON EVER DONE IT BEFORE?" AND WHILE THAT MAY BE A RELEVANT
QUESTION, ON THE ISSUE OF PROBABLE CAUSE, IT HAS TO BE
ASSESSED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS. IN OTHER WORDS, THE
EVIDENCE OF THIS OCCASION OF CRIME THAT'S ALLEGED MUST BE
ADEQUATE WITHOUT REGARD TO WHAT THE PERSON HAS DONE IN THE
PAST. I WOULDN'T WANT THAT QUESTION ANSWERED UNTIL AFTER THE
GRAND JURY HAD MADE A DETERMINATION OF WHETHER THERE WAS
ENOUGH EVIDENCE.

SO WHEN I APPEARED IN FRONT OF THE GRAND JURY, I'D
TELL THEM "YOU'LL GET YOUR QUESTION ANSWERED, BUT I'D LIKE YOU
TO VOTE ON THE INDICTMENT FIRST. I'D LIKE YOU TO DETERMINE
WHETHER THERE'S ENOUGH EVIDENCE BASED ON WHAT'S BEEN
PRESENTED, AND THEN WE'LL ANSWER IT." I DIDN'T WANT TO
PREJUDICE THE GRAND JURY. THERE MAY BE SIMILAR CONCERNS THAT
COME UP. NOW, THE PRACTICES VARY AMONG THE ASSISTANT U.S.
ATTORNEYS THAT WILL APPEAR IN FRONT OF YOU.

ON OTHER OCCASIONS WHEN I DIDN'T THINK THERE WAS ANY RISK THAT MIGHT PREJUDICE THE PROCESS, I WOULD ALLOW THE GRAND JURY TO FOLLOW UP THEMSELVES AND ASK QUESTIONS. A LOT OF TIMES, THE FOLLOW-UPS ARE FACTUAL ON DETAILED MATTERS. THAT PRACTICE WILL VARY DEPENDING ON WHO IS REPRESENTING THE UNITED

STATES AND PRESENTING THE CASE TO YOU. THE POINT IS YOU HAVE
THE RIGHT TO ASK ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS OR TO ASK THAT THOSE
QUESTIONS BE PUT TO THE WITNESS.

IN THE EVENT A WITNESS DOESN'T SPEAK OR UNDERSTAND ENGLISH, THEN ANOTHER PERSON WILL BE BROUGHT INTO THE ROOM.

OBVIOUSLY, THAT WOULD BE AN INTERPRETER TO ALLOW YOU TO UNDERSTAND THE ANSWERS. WHEN WITNESSES DO APPEAR IN FRONT OF THE GRAND JURY, THEY SHOULD BE TREATED COURTEOUSLY. QUESTIONS SHOULD BE PUT TO THEM IN AN ORDERLY FASHION. THE QUESTIONS SHOULD NOT BE HOSTILE.

IF YOU HAVE ANY DOUBT WHETHER IT'S PROPER TO ASK A PARTICULAR QUESTION, THEN YOU CAN ASK THE U.S. ATTORNEY WHO'S ASSISTING IN THE INVESTIGATION FOR ADVICE ON THE MATTER. YOU ALONE AS GRAND JURORS DECIDE HOW MANY WITNESSES YOU WANT TO HEAR. WITNESSES CAN BE SUBPOENAED FROM ANYWHERE IN THE COUNTRY. YOU HAVE NATIONAL JURISDICTION.

HOWEVER, PERSONS SHOULD NOT ORDINARILY BE SUBJECTED TO DISRUPTION OF THEIR DAILY LIVES UNLESS THERE'S GOOD REASON. THEY SHOULDN'T BE HARASSED OR ANNOYED OR INCONVENIENCED. THAT'S NOT THE PURPOSE OF THE GRAND JURY HEARING, NOR SHOULD PUBLIC FUNDS BE EXPENDED TO BRING WITNESSES UNLESS YOU BELIEVE THAT THE WITNESSES CAN PROVIDE MEANINGFUL, RELEVANT EVIDENCE WHICH WILL ASSIST IN YOUR DETERMINATIONS AND YOUR INVESTIGATION.

ALL WITNESSES WHO ARE CALLED IN FRONT OF THE GRAND

2.4

JURY HAVE CERTAIN RIGHTS. THESE INCLUDE, AMONG OTHERS, THE RIGHT TO REFUSE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ON THE GROUNDS THAT THE ANSWER TO A QUESTION MIGHT INCRIMINATE THEM AND THE RIGHT TO KNOW THAT ANYTHING THEY SAY MIGHT BE USED AGAINST THEM.

THE U.S. ATTORNEYS ARE CHARGED WITH THE OBLIGATION, WHEN THEY'RE AWARE OF IT, OF ADVISING PEOPLE OF THIS RIGHT BEFORE THEY QUESTION THEM. BUT BEAR THAT IN MIND.

IF A WITNESS DOES EXERCISE THE RIGHT AGAINST

SELF-INCRIMINATION, THEN THE GRAND JURY SHOULD NOT HOLD THAT

AS ANY PREJUDICE OR BIAS AGAINST THAT WITNESS. IT CAN PLAY NO

PART IN THE RETURN OF AN INDICTMENT AGAINST THE WITNESS. IN

OTHER WORDS, THE MERE EXERCISE OF THE PRIVILEGE AGAINST

SELF-INCRIMINATION, WHICH ALL OF US HAVE AS UNITED STATES

RESIDENTS, SHOULD NOT FACTOR INTO YOUR DETERMINATION OF

WHETHER THERE'S PROBABLE CAUSE TO GO FORWARD IN THIS CASE.

YOU MUST RESPECT THAT DETERMINATION BY THE PERSON AND NOT USE

IT AGAINST THEM.

IT'S AN UNCOMMON SITUATION THAT YOU'LL FACE WHEN SOMEBODY DOES CLAIM THE PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION. THAT'S BECAUSE USUALLY AT THE TIME A PERSON IS SUBPOENAED, IF THERE'S A PROSPECT THAT THEY'RE GOING TO CLAIM THE PRIVILEGE, THE U.S. ATTORNEY IS PUT ON NOTICE OF THAT BEFOREHAND EITHER BY THE PERSON HIMSELF OR HERSELF OR MAYBE A LAWYER REPRESENTING THE PERSON.

IN MY EXPERIENCE, MOST OF THE TIME THE U.S. ATTORNEY

2.4

WILL NOT THEN CALL THE PERSON IN FRONT OF YOU BECAUSE IT WOULD BE TO NO EFFECT TO CALL THEM AND HAVE THEM ASSERT THEIR 5TH AMENDMENT PRIVILEGE. BUT IT SOMETIMES DOES COME UP. IT SOMETIMES HAPPENS. SOMETIMES THERE'S A QUESTION OF WHETHER THE PERSON HAS A BONA FIDE PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION. THAT'S A MATTER FOR THE COURT TO DETERMINE IN ANCILLARY PROCEEDINGS. OR THE U.S. ATTORNEY MAY BE UNAWARE OF A PERSON'S INCLINATION TO ASSERT THE 5TH. SO IT MAY COME UP IN FRONT OF YOU. IT DOESN'T ALWAYS COME UP.

AS I MENTIONED TO YOU IN MY PRELIMINARY REMARKS,
WITNESSES ARE NOT PERMITTED TO HAVE A LAWYER WITH THEM IN THE
GRAND JURY ROOM. THE LAW DOESN'T PERMIT A WITNESS SUMMONED
BEFORE THE GRAND JURY TO BRING THE LAWYER WITH THEM, ALTHOUGH
WITNESSES DO HAVE A RIGHT TO CONFER WITH THEIR LAWYERS DURING
THE COURSE OF GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION PROVIDED THE CONFERENCE
OCCURS OUTSIDE THE GRAND JURY ROOM.

YOU MAY FACE A SITUATION WHERE A WITNESS SAYS "I'D LIKE TO TALK TO MY LAWYER BEFORE I ANSWER THAT QUESTION," IN WHICH CASE THE PERSON WOULD LEAVE THE ROOM, CONSULT WITH THE LAWYER, AND THEN COME BACK INTO THE ROOM WHERE FURTHER ACTION WOULD TAKE PLACE.

APPEARANCES BEFORE A GRAND JURY SOMETIMES PRESENT

COMPLEX LEGAL PROBLEMS THAT REQUIRE THE ASSISTANCE OF LAWYERS.

YOU'RE NOT TO DRAW ANY ADVERSE INFERENCE IF A WITNESS DOES ASK

TO LEAVE THE ROOM TO SPEAK TO HIS LAWYER OR HER LAWYER AND

2.4

THEN LEAVES FOR THAT PURPOSE.

ORDINARILY, NEITHER THE ACCUSED OR ANY WITNESS ON
THE ACCUSED'S BEHALF WILL TESTIFY IN THE GRAND JURY SESSION.
BUT UPON THE REQUEST OF AN ACCUSED, PREFERABLY IN WRITING, YOU
MAY AFFORD THE ACCUSED AN OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR IN FRONT OF
YOU.

AS I'VE SAID, THESE PROCEEDINGS TEND TO BE ONE-SIDED NECESSARILY. THE PROSECUTOR IS ASKING YOU TO RETURN AN INDICTMENT TO A CRIMINAL CHARGE, AND THEY'LL MUSTER THE EVIDENCE THAT THEY HAVE THAT THEY BELIEVE SUPPORTS PROBABLE CAUSE AND PRESENT THAT TO YOU. BECAUSE IT'S NOT A FULL-BLOWN TRIAL, YOU'RE LIKELY IN MOST CASES NOT TO HEAR THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STORY, IF THERE IS ANOTHER SIDE TO THE STORY. THERE'S NO PROVISION OF LAW THAT ALLOWS AN ACCUSED, FOR EXAMPLE, TO CONTEST THE MATTER IN FRONT OF THE GRAND JURY.

IT MAY HAPPEN, AS I SAID, THAT AN ACCUSED MAY ASK TO APPEAR IN FRONT OF YOU. BECAUSE THE APPEARANCE OF SOMEONE ACCUSED OF A CRIME MAY RAISE COMPLICATED LEGAL PROBLEMS, YOU SHOULD SEEK THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S ADVICE AND COUNSEL, IF NECESSARY, AND THAT OF THE COURT BEFORE ALLOWING THAT.

BEFORE ANY ACCUSED PERSON IS ALLOWED TO TESTIFY,
THEY MUST BE ADVISED OF THEIR RIGHTS, AND YOU SHOULD BE
COMPLETELY SATISFIED THAT THEY UNDERSTAND WHAT THEY'RE DOING.

YOU'RE NOT REQUIRED TO SUMMON WITNESSES WHICH AN ACCUSED PERSON MAY WANT YOU TO HAVE EXAMINED UNLESS PROBABLE

CAUSE FOR AN INDICTMENT MAY BE EXPLAINED AWAY BY THE TESTIMONY OF THOSE WITNESSES.

NOW, AGAIN, THIS EMPHASIZES THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
THE FUNCTION OF THE GRAND JURY AND THE TRIAL JURY. YOU'RE ALL
ABOUT PROBABLE CAUSE. IF YOU THINK THAT THERE'S EVIDENCE OUT
THERE THAT MIGHT CAUSE YOU TO SAY "WELL, I DON'T THINK
PROBABLE CAUSE EXISTS," THEN IT'S INCUMBENT UPON YOU TO HEAR
THAT EVIDENCE AS WELL. AS I TOLD YOU, IN MOST INSTANCES, THE
U.S. ATTORNEYS ARE DUTY-BOUND TO PRESENT EVIDENCE THAT CUTS
AGAINST WHAT THEY MAY BE ASKING YOU TO DO IF THEY'RE AWARE OF
THAT EVIDENCE.

THE DETERMINATION OF WHETHER A WITNESS IS TELLING
THE TRUTH IS SOMETHING FOR YOU TO DECIDE. NEITHER THE COURT
NOR THE PROSECUTORS NOR ANY OFFICERS OF THE COURT MAY MAKE
THAT DETERMINATION FOR YOU. IT'S THE EXCLUSIVE PROVINCE OF
GRAND JURORS TO DETERMINE WHO IS CREDIBLE AND WHO MAY NOT BE.

FINALLY, LET ME TELL YOU THIS: THERE'S ANOTHER

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN OUR GRAND JURY PROCEDURE HERE AND

PROCEDURES YOU MAY BE FAMILIAR WITH HAVING SERVED ON STATE

TRIAL JURIES OR FEDERAL TRIAL JURIES OR EVEN ON THE STATE

GRAND JURY; HEARSAY TESTIMONY, THAT IS, TESTIMONY AS TO FACTS

NOT PERSONALLY KNOWN BY THE WITNESS, BUT WHICH THE WITNESS HAS

BEEN TOLD OR RELATED BY OTHER PERSONS MAY BE DEEMED BY YOU

PERSUASIVE AND MAY PROVIDE A BASIS FOR RETURNING AN INDICTMENT

AGAINST AN ACCUSED.

2.4

2.4

WHAT I MEAN BY THAT IS IF IT'S A FULL-BLOWN TRIAL WHERE THE RULES OF EVIDENCE APPLY -- AND ALL OF US ARE FAMILIAR WITH THIS TERM "HEARSAY EVIDENCE." GENERALLY, IT FORBIDS SOMEBODY FROM REPEATING WHAT SOMEONE ELSE TOLD THEM OUTSIDE OF COURT. OH, THERE'S A MILLION EXCEPTIONS TO THE HEARSAY RULE, BUT THAT'S THE GIST OF THE RULE.

USUALLY, WE INSIST ON THE SPEAKER OF THE WORDS TO

COME IN SO THAT WE CAN KNOW THE CONTEXT OF IT. THAT RULE

DOESN'T APPLY IN THE GRAND JURY CONTEXT. BECAUSE IT'S A

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDING, BECAUSE ULTIMATELY GUILT OR INNOCENCE

IS NOT BEING DETERMINED, THE EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS ARE

RELAXED. THE PROSECUTORS ARE ENTITLED TO PUT ON HEARSAY

EVIDENCE.

HOW DOES THAT PLAY OUT IN REAL LIFE? WELL, YOU'RE GOING TO BE HEARING A LOT OF BORDER TYPE CASES. IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE, IT'S NOT EFFICIENT, IT'S NOT COST-EFFECTIVE TO PULL ALL OF OUR BORDER GUARDS OFF THE BORDER TO COME UP AND TESTIFY. WHO IS LEFT GUARDING THE BORDER, THEN?

WHAT THEY'VE DONE IN THE BORDER CASES IN PARTICULAR IF THEY USUALLY HAVE A SUMMARY WITNESS; A WITNESS FROM, FOR EXAMPLE, BORDER PATROL OR CUSTOMS WHO WILL TALK TO THE PEOPLE OR READ THE REPORTS OF THE PEOPLE WHO ACTUALLY MADE THE ARREST. THAT PERSON WILL COME IN AND TESTIFY ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED. THE PERSON WON'T HAVE FIRST-HAND KNOWLEDGE, BUT THEY'LL BE RELIABLY INFORMED BY THE PERSON WITH FIRST-HAND

KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT OCCURRED, AND THEY'LL BE THE WITNESS BEFORE
THE GRAND JURY.

YOU SHOULD EXPECT AND COUNT ON THE FACT THAT YOU'RE GOING TO HEAR EVIDENCE IN THE FORM OF HEARSAY THAT WOULD NOT BE ADMISSIBLE IF THE CASE GOES FORWARD TO TRIAL, BUT IS ADMISSIBLE AT THE GRAND JURY STAGE.

AFTER YOU'VE HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE THAT THE U.S.

ATTORNEY INTENDS TO PRESENT OR THAT YOU WANT TO HEAR IN A

PARTICULAR MATTER, YOU'RE THEN CHARGED WITH THE OBLIGATION OF

DELIBERATING TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE ACCUSED PERSON OUGHT TO

BE INDICTED. NO ONE OTHER THAN YOUR OWN MEMBERS, THE MEMBERS

OF THE GRAND JURY, IS TO BE PRESENT IN THE GRAND JURY ROOM

WHILE YOU'RE DELIBERATING.

WHAT THAT MEANS IS THE COURT REPORTER, THE ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY, ANYONE ELSE, THE INTERPRETER WHO MAY HAVE BEEN PRESENT TO INTERPRET FOR A WITNESS, MUST GO OUT OF THE ROOM, AND THE PROCEEDING MUST GO FORWARD WITH ONLY GRAND JURORS PRESENT DURING THE DELIBERATION AND VOTING ON AN INDICTMENT.

YOU HEARD ME EXPLAIN EARLIER THAT AT VARIOUS TIMES
DURING THE PRESENTATION OF MATTERS BEFORE YOU, OTHER PEOPLE
MAY BE PRESENT IN THE GRAND JURY. THIS IS PERFECTLY
ACCEPTABLE. THE RULE THAT I HAVE JUST READ TO YOU ABOUT YOUR
PRESENCE ALONE IN THE GRAND JURY ROOM APPLIES ONLY DURING
DELIBERATION AND VOTING ON INDICTMENTS.

TO RETURN AN INDICTMENT CHARGING SOMEONE WITH AN

2.4

OFFENSE, IT'S NOT NECESSARY, AS I MENTIONED MANY TIMES, THAT
YOU FIND PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. THAT'S THE TRIAL
STANDARD, NOT THE GRAND JURY STANDARD. YOUR TASK IS TO
DETERMINE WHETHER THE GOVERNMENT'S EVIDENCE, AS PRESENTED TO
YOU, IS SUFFICIENT TO CONCLUDE THAT THERE'S PROBABLE CAUSE TO
BELIEVE THAT THE ACCUSED IS GUILTY OF THE PROPOSED OR CHARGED
OFFENSE.

I EXPLAINED TO YOU WHAT THAT STANDARD MEANS. LET ME, AT THE RISK OF BORING YOU, TELL YOU ONE MORE TIME.

PROBABLE CAUSE MEANS THAT YOU HAVE AN HONESTLY HELD CONSCIENTIOUS BELIEF AND THAT THE BELIEF IS REASONABLE THAT A FEDERAL CRIME WAS COMMITTED AND THAT THE PERSON TO BE INDICTED WAS SOMEHOW ASSOCIATED WITH THE COMMISSION OF THAT CRIME.

EITHER THEY COMMITTED IT THEMSELVES OR THEY HELPED SOMEONE COMMIT IT OR THEY WERE PART OF A CONSPIRACY, AN ILLEGAL AGREEMENT, TO COMMIT THAT CRIME.

TO PUT IT ANOTHER WAY, YOU SHOULD VOTE TO INDICT
WHEN THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED TO YOU IS SUFFICIENTLY STRONG TO
WARRANT A REASONABLE PERSON TO BELIEVE THAT THE ACCUSED IS
PROBABLY GUILTY OF THE OFFENSE WHICH IS PROPOSED.

EACH GRAND JUROR HAS THE RIGHT TO EXPRESS VIEWS ON THE MATTER UNDER CONSIDERATION. AND ONLY AFTER ALL GRAND JURORS HAVE BEEN GIVEN A FULL OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD SHOULD YOU VOTE ON THE MATTER BEFORE YOU. YOU MAY DECIDE AFTER DELIBERATION AMONG YOURSELVES THAT YOU NEED MORE EVIDENCE,

2.4

THAT MORE EVIDENCE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED BEFORE A VOTE IS

TAKEN. IN SUCH CASES, THE U.S ATTORNEY OR THE ASSISTANT U.S.

ATTORNEY CAN BE DIRECTED TO SUBPOENA ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS OR

WITNESSES FOR YOU TO CONSIDER IN ORDER TO MAKE YOUR

DETERMINATION.

WHEN YOU'VE DECIDED TO VOTE, THE FOREPERSON SHOULD KEEP A RECORD OF THE VOTE. THAT RECORD SHOULD BE FILED WITH THE CLERK OF THE COURT. THE RECORD DOESN'T INCLUDE THE NAMES OF THE JURORS OR HOW THEY VOTED, BUT ONLY THE NUMBER OF VOTES FOR THE INDICTMENT. SO IT'S AN ANONYMOUS VOTE. YOU'LL KNOW AMONG YOURSELVES WHO VOTED WHICH WAY, BUT THAT INFORMATION DOES NOT GET CAPTURED OR RECORDED, JUST THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE VOTING FOR INDICTMENT.

IF 12 OR MORE MEMBERS OF THE GRAND JURY AFTER
DELIBERATION BELIEVE THAT AN INDICTMENT IS WARRANTED, THEN
YOU'LL REQUEST THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY TO PREPARE A FORMAL
WRITTEN INDICTMENT IF ONE'S NOT ALREADY BEEN PREPARED AND
PRESENTED TO YOU. IN MY EXPERIENCE, MOST OF THE TIME THE U.S.
ATTORNEY WILL SHOW UP WITH THE WITNESSES AND WILL HAVE THE
PROPOSED INDICTMENT WITH THEM. SO YOU'LL HAVE THAT TO
CONSIDER. YOU'LL KNOW EXACTLY WHAT THE PROPOSED CHARGES ARE.

THE INDICTMENT WILL SET FORTH THE DATE AND THE PLACE

OF THE ALLEGED OFFENSE AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT THE U.S.

ATTORNEY BELIEVES MAKES THE CONDUCT CRIMINAL. IT WILL

IDENTIFY THE CRIMINAL STATUTES THAT HAVE ALLEGEDLY BEEN

2.4

VIOLATED.

2.4

THE FOREPERSON, UPON THE GRAND JURY VOTING TO RETURN THE INDICTMENT, WILL THEN ENDORSE OR SIGN THE INDICTMENT, WHAT'S CALLED A TRUE BILL OF INDICTMENT. THERE'S A SPACE PROVIDED BY THE WORD -- OR FOLLOWED BY THE WORD "FOREPERSON." THE FOREPERSON IS TO SIGN THE INDICTMENT IF THE GRAND JURY BELIEVES THAT THERE'S PROBABLE CAUSE. A TRUE BILL SIGNIFIES THAT 12 OR MORE GRAND JURORS HAVE AGREED THAT THE CASE OUGHT TO GO FORWARD WITH PROBABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE THAT THE PERSON PROPOSED FOR THE CHARGE IS GUILTY OF THE CRIME.

IT'S THE DUTY OF THE FOREPERSON TO ENDORSE OR SIGN EVERY INDICTMENT VOTED ON BY AT LEAST 12 MEMBERS EVEN IF THE FOREPERSON HAS VOTED AGAINST RETURNING THE INDICTMENT. SO IF YOU'VE BEEN DESIGNATED A FOREPERSON OR AN ASSISTANT FOREPERSON, EVEN IF YOU VOTED THE OTHER WAY OR YOU'RE OUT-VOTED, IF THERE'S AT LEAST 12 WHO VOTED FOR THE INDICTMENT, THEN YOU MUST SIGN THE INDICTMENT.

IF YOU WERE THE 12 MEMBERS OF THE GRAND JURY WHO VOTED IN FAVOR OF THE INDICTMENT, THEN THE FOREPERSON WILL ENDORSE THE INDICTMENT WITH THESE WORDS: "NOT A TRUE BILL."

THEY'LL RETURN IT TO THE COURT. THE COURT WILL IMPOUND IT.

THE INDICTMENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN ENDORSED AS A TRUE BILL ARE PRESENTED EITHER TO ONE OF OUR MAGISTRATE JUDGES OR TO A DISTRICT JUDGE IN OPEN COURT BY YOUR FOREPERSON AT THE CONCLUSION OF EACH SESSION OF THE GRAND JURY. THIS IS THE

PROCEDURE THAT YOU HEARD ME ALLUDE TO. IN THE ABSENCE OF THE FOREPERSON, THE DEPUTY FOREPERSON SHALL PERFORM ALL THE FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF THE FOREPERSON.

LET ME EMPHASIZE AGAIN IT'S EXTREMELY IMPORTANT FOR
THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE GRAND JURORS TO REALIZE THAT UNDER OUR
CONSTITUTION, THE GRAND JURY IS AN INDEPENDENT BODY. IT'S
INDEPENDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY. IT'S NOT AN ARM OR
AN AGENT OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION OF THE DRUG
ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION, THE IRS, OR ANY OTHER GOVERNMENT
AGENCY CHARGED WITH PROSECUTING THE CRIME.

I USED THE CHARACTERIZATION EARLIER THAT YOU STAND

AS A BUFFER BETWEEN OUR GOVERNMENT'S ABILITY TO ACCUSE SOMEONE

OF A CRIME AND THEN PUTTING THAT PERSON THROUGH THE BURDEN OF

STANDING TRIAL. YOU ACT AS AN INDEPENDENT BODY OF CITIZENS.

IN RECENT YEARS, THERE HAS BEEN CRITICISM OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE GRAND JURY. THE CRITICISM GENERALLY IS THE GRAND JURY ACTS AS RUBBER STAMPS AND APPROVES PROSECUTIONS THAT ARE BROUGHT BY THE GOVERNMENT WITHOUT THOUGHT.

INTERESTINGLY ENOUGH, IN MY DISCUSSION WITH
PROSPECTIVE GRAND JURORS, WE HAD ONE FELLOW WHO SAID, "YEAH,
THAT'S THE WAY I THINK IT OUGHT TO BE." WELL, THAT'S NOT THE
WAY IT IS. AS A PRACTICAL MATTER, YOU WILL WORK CLOSELY WITH
GOVERNMENT LAWYERS. THE U.S. ATTORNEY AND THE ASSISTANT U.S.
ATTORNEYS WILL PROVIDE YOU WITH IMPORTANT SERVICES AND HELP
YOU FIND YOUR WAY WHEN YOU'RE CONFRONTED WITH COMPLEX LEGAL

2.4

MATTERS. IT'S ENTIRELY PROPER THAT YOU SHOULD RECEIVE THE ASSISTANCE FROM THE GOVERNMENT LAWYERS.

BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY, THE DECISION ABOUT
WHETHER A CASE GOES FORWARD AND AN INDICTMENT SHOULD BE
RETURNED IS YOURS AND YOURS ALONE. IF PAST EXPERIENCE IS ANY
INDICATION OF WHAT TO EXPECT IN THE FUTURE, THEN YOU CAN
EXPECT THAT THE U.S. ATTORNEYS THAT WILL APPEAR IN FRONT OF
YOU WILL BE CANDID, THEY'LL BE HONEST, THAT THEY'LL ACT IN
GOOD FAITH IN ALL MATTERS PRESENTED TO YOU.

HOWEVER, AS I SAID, ULTIMATELY YOU HAVE TO DEPEND ON YOUR INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT IN MAKING THE DECISION THAT YOU ARE CHARGED WITH MAKING AS GRAND JURORS. YOU'RE NOT AN ARM OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. YOU'RE NOT AN ARM OF ANY GOVERNMENT AGENCY. THE GOVERNMENT'S LAWYERS ARE PROSECUTORS, AND YOU'RE NOT.

IF THE FACTS SUGGEST TO YOU THAT YOU SHOULD NOT INDICT, THEN YOU SHOULD NOT DO SO EVEN IN THE FACE OF OPPOSITION OR STATEMENTS OR ARGUMENTS FROM ONE OF THE ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS. YOU SHOULD NOT SURRENDER AN HONESTLY OR CONSCIOUSLY HELD BELIEF WITHOUT THE WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE AND SIMPLY DEFER TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY. THAT'S YOUR DECISION TO MAKE.

JUST AS YOU MUST MAINTAIN YOUR INDEPENDENCE IN YOUR DEALINGS WITH GOVERNMENT LAWYERS, YOUR DEALINGS WITH THE COURT MUST BE ON A FORMAL BASIS, ALSO. IF YOU HAVE A QUESTION FOR

2.4

2.4

THE COURT OR A DESIRE TO MAKE A PRESENTMENT OR A RETURN OF AN INDICTMENT TO THE COURT, THEN YOU MAY CONTACT ME THROUGH MY CLERK. YOU'LL BE ABLE TO ASSEMBLE IN THE COURTROOM OFTENTIMES FOR THESE PURPOSES.

LET ME TELL YOU ALSO THAT EACH GRAND JUROR IS
DIRECTED TO REPORT IMMEDIATELY TO THE COURT ANY ATTEMPT BY
ANYBODY UNDER ANY PRETENSE WHATSOEVER TO ADDRESS YOU OR
CONTACT YOU FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRYING TO GAIN INFORMATION
ABOUT WHAT'S GOING ON IN FRONT OF THE GRAND JURY. THAT SHOULD
NOT HAPPEN. IF IT DOES HAPPEN, I SHOULD BE INFORMED OF THAT
IMMEDIATELY BY ANY OF YOU, COLLECTIVELY OR INDIVIDUALLY. IF
ANY PERSON CONTACTS YOU OR ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE YOU IN ANY
MANNER IN CARRYING OUT YOUR DUTIES AS A GRAND JUROR, LET ME
KNOW ABOUT IT.

LET ME TALK A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT THE OBLIGATION

OF SECRECY, WHICH I'VE MENTIONED AND ALLUDED TO. AS I TOLD

YOU BEFORE, THE HALLMARK OF THE GRAND JURY, PARTICULARLY OUR

FEDERAL GRAND JURY, IS THAT IT OPERATES SECRETLY. IT OPERATES

IN SECRECY, AND ITS PROCEEDINGS ARE ENTIRELY SECRET.

YOUR PROCEEDINGS AS GRAND JURORS ARE ALWAYS SECRET,
AND THEY MUST REMAIN SECRET PERMANENTLY UNLESS AND UNTIL THE
COURT DETERMINES OTHERWISE. YOU CAN'T RELATE TO YOUR FAMILY,
THE NEWS MEDIA, TELEVISION REPORTERS, OR TO ANYONE WHAT
HAPPENED IN FRONT OF THE GRAND JURY. IN FACT, TO DO SO IS TO
COMMIT A CRIMINAL OFFENSE. YOU COULD BE HELD CRIMINALLY

LIABLE FOR REVEALING WHAT OCCURRED IN FRONT OF THE GRAND JURY.

THERE ARE SEVERAL IMPORTANT REASONS WHY WE DEMAND SECRECY IN THE INSTITUTION OF THE GRAND JURY. FIRST -- AND I MENTIONED THIS, AND THIS IS OBVIOUS -- THE PREMATURE DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION THAT THE GRAND JURY IS ACTING ON COULD VERY WELL FRUSTRATE THE ENDS OF JUSTICE IN PARTICULAR CASES. IT MIGHT GIVE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR SOMEONE WHO'S ACCUSED OF A CRIME TO ESCAPE OR BECOME A FUGITIVE OR TO DESTROY EVIDENCE THAT MIGHT OTHERWISE BE UNCOVERED LATER ON. YOU DON'T WANT TO DO THAT.

IN THE COURSE OF AN INVESTIGATION, IT'S ABSOLUTELY
IMPERATIVE THAT THE INVESTIGATION AND THE FACTS OF THE
INVESTIGATION REMAIN SECRET, AND YOU SHOULD KEEP THAT FOREMOST
IN YOUR MIND. ALSO, IF THE TESTIMONY OF A WITNESS IS
DISCLOSED, THE WITNESS MAY BE SUBJECT TO INTIMIDATION OR
SOMETIMES RETALIATION OR BODILY INJURY BEFORE THE WITNESS IS
ABLE TO TESTIFY. IT IS SOMETHING THAT THE LAW ENFORCEMENT -IT'S SOMETIMES THE CASE THAT LAW ENFORCEMENT WILL TELL A
WITNESS WHO IS COOPERATING WITH AN INVESTIGATION THAT THEIR
SECRECY IS GUARANTEED. IT SOMETIMES TAKES THAT KIND OF
ASSURANCE FROM THE POLICE OR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENTS TO GET A
WITNESS TO TELL WHAT THEY KNOW. AND THAT GUARANTEE CAN ONLY
BE SECURED IF YOU MAINTAIN THE OBLIGATION OF SECRECY.

THE GRAND JURY IS FORBIDDEN BY LAW FROM DISCLOSING
ANY INFORMATION ABOUT THE GRAND JURY PROCESS WHATSOEVER. IT'S

ON THE BASIS SOMETIMES OF REPRESENTATIONS LIKE THAT RELUCTANT WITNESSES DO COME FORWARD. AGAIN, IT UNDERSCORES THE IMPORTANCE OF SECRECY.

AS I'VE ALSO MENTIONED, THE REQUIREMENT OF SECRECY PROTECTS INNOCENT PEOPLE WHO MAY HAVE COME UNDER INVESTIGATION, BUT WHO ARE CLEARED BY THE ACTIONS OF THE GRAND JURY. IT'S A TERRIBLE THING TO BE IMPROPERLY ACCUSED OF A CRIME. IT'S LIKE A SCARLET LETTER THAT PEOPLE SOMETIMES WEAR FOREVER. IT'S WORSE IF THE CRIME OR THE ACCUSATION NEVER BECOMES FORMAL. JUST THE IDEA THAT SOMEONE IS UNDER INVESTIGATION CAN HAVE DISASTROUS CONSEQUENCES FOR THAT PERSON OR HIS OR HER BUSINESS OR HIS OR HER FAMILY. THIS IS ANOTHER IMPORTANT REASON WHY THE GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS MUST REMAIN SECRET.

IN THE EYES OF SOME PEOPLE, INVESTIGATION BY THE GRAND JURY ALONE CARRIES WITH IT THE STIGMA OR SUGGESTION OF GUILT. SO GREAT INJURY CAN BE DONE TO A PERSON'S GOOD NAME EVEN THOUGH ULTIMATELY YOU DECIDE THAT THERE'S NO EVIDENCE SUPPORTING AN INDICTMENT OF THE PERSON.

TO ENSURE THE SECRECY OF THE GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS,
THE LAW PROVIDES THAT ONLY AUTHORIZED PEOPLE MAY BE IN THE
GRAND JURY ROOM WHILE EVIDENCE IS BEING PRESENTED. AS I'VE
MENTIONED TO YOU NOW SEVERAL TIMES, THE ONLY PEOPLE WHO MAY BE
PRESENT DURING THE FUNCTIONING OF THE GRAND JURY ARE THE GRAND
JURORS THEMSELVES, THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY OR AN ASSISTANT

2.4

WHO'S PRESENTING THE CASE, A WITNESS WHO IS THEN UNDER EXAMINATION, A COURT REPORTER, AND AN INTERPRETER, IF NECESSARY. ALL THE OTHERS EXCEPT THE GRAND JURORS GO OUT DURING THE DELIBERATION AND VOTING.

YOU MAY DISCLOSE TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY WHO IS
ASSISTING THE GRAND JURY CERTAIN INFORMATION. AS I SAID, IF
YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, IF GRAND JURORS HAVE QUESTIONS THAT THEY
WANT ANSWERED, OBVIOUSLY THAT INFORMATION IS TO BE CONVEYED TO
THE U.S. ATTORNEY TO GET THE QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

BUT YOU SHOULD NOT DISCLOSE THE CONTEXT OF YOUR DELIBERATIONS OR THE VOTE OF ANY PARTICULAR GRAND JUROR TO ANYONE, EVEN THE GOVERNMENT LAWYERS, ONCE THE VOTE HAS BEEN DONE. THAT'S ONLY THE BUSINESS OF THE GRAND JURY. IN OTHER WORDS, YOU'RE NOT TO INFORM THE GOVERNMENT LAWYER WHO VOTED ONE WAY ON THE INDICTMENT AND WHO VOTED THE OTHER WAY.

LET ME CONCLUDE NOW -- I APPRECIATE YOUR PATIENCE,

AND IT'S BEEN A LONG SESSION THIS MORNING -- BY SAYING THAT

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SERVICE YOU PERFORM IS DEMONSTRATED BY

THE VERY IMPORTANT AND COMPREHENSIVE OATH WHICH YOU TOOK A

SHORT WHILE AGO. IT'S AN OATH THAT IS ROOTED IN OUR HISTORY

AS A COUNTRY. THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE BEFORE YOU HAVE TAKEN A

SIMILAR OATH. AND AS GOOD CITIZENS, YOU SHOULD BE PROUD TO

HAVE BEEN SELECTED TO ASSIST IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

IT HAS BEEN MY PLEASURE TO MEET YOU. I WOULD BE HAPPY TO SEE YOU IN THE FUTURE IF THE NEED ARISES. AT THIS

## **EXHIBIT B**

# SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA-WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2007-10:45 A.M.

MR. HAMRICK: YOU AND EACH OF YOU DO SOLEMNLY SWEAR OR AFFIRM THAT YOU WILL GIVE TRUE ANSWERS TO ALL QUESTIONS THAT WILL BE PUT TO YOU TOUCHING ON YOUR QUALIFICATION TO SERVE AS A GRAND JUROR DURING THIS SESSION OF COURT, SO HELP YOU?

(ALL GRAND JURORS RESPOND AFFIRMATIVELY)

MR. HAMRICK: THANK YOU. PLEASE BE SEATED AND COME
TO ORDER.

THE COURT: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, GOOD MORNING AND WELCOME TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA. YOU'RE HERE TODAY IN CONNECTION WITH OUR EFFORT TO IMPANEL GRAND JURIES. I KNOW ALL OF YOU HAVE SEEN THE FILM ABOUT THE FUNCTION OF THE GRAND JURY. I'M GOING TO TALK A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT THAT LATER IN MY REMARKS AND MY INTERACTIONS WITH YOU TODAY.

WE'RE ESSENTIALLY LOOKING FOR PEOPLE WHO CAN FAIRLY
AND CONSCIENTIOUSLY EVALUATE A SET OF FACTS AND MAKE AN
IMPORTANT DECISION ABOUT WHETHER CASES SHOULD MOVE FORWARD TO
TRIAL. THAT'S THE FUNCTION OF THE GRAND JURY. YOU'RE TO WEED
OUT THE GROUNDLESS CHARGES FROM THOSE THAT HAVE MERIT,
ALTHOUGH ACKNOWLEDGING THAT YOU'RE NOT MAKING A FINAL DECISION
ON WHETHER A PERSON IS GUILTY OR NOT OF A CRIMINAL CHARGE.
BUT THE IDEA OF PUTTING A PERSON THROUGH A TRIAL OF ITSELF IS
A SIGNIFICANT RESPONSIBILITY, AND THAT'S THE RESPONSIBILITY

THAT WE CALL ON YOU TO FULFILL. .

MY NAME IS LARRY BURNS. I'M THE JURY JUDGE. I'LL TELL YOU A LITTLE BIT ABOUT OUR COURT.

WE HAVE 12 ACTIVE JUDGES HERE NOW AND FIVE SENIOR JUDGES. WHEN A FEDERAL JUDGE TURNS 65 AND ASSUMING THEIR AGE AND THEIR YEARS OF SERVICE ADD UP TO 80, THEY CAN GO SENIOR AND WORK A REDUCED CASELOAD. BUT OUR SENIORS IN OUR VERY BUSY DISTRICT WORK VERY, VERY HARD.

EACH OF US, EACH OF OUR JUDGES HERE, WAS APPOINTED BY ONE OF THE PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CONFIRMED BY THE SENATE. WE HAVE A VERY BUSY, ACTIVE DISTRICT HERE. OUR PROXIMITY TO THE BORDER GIVES US LOTS OF CASES. I THINK IF YOU SERVE ON THE GRAND JURY OR IF YOU'VE BEEN HERE BEFORE SERVING AS A TRIAL JUROR, YOU'RE AWARE THAT PEOPLE TRY TO BRING THE STRANGEST THINGS ACROSS THE BORDER, A LOT OF WHICH ARE PROHIBITED; PEOPLE, DRUGS, PARROTS, KNOCK-OFF CALVIN KLEIN JEANS. ALL THOSE THINGS ARE NOW IMPLICATED BY THE FEDERAL LAWS.

LET ME INTRODUCE THE CLERK OF OUR COURT,
MR. HAMRICK. HE'S THE THAT CALLED COURT TO ORDER.

WE ALSO HAVE SOME REPRESENTATIVES HERE FROM THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. THEY WORK VERY CLOSELY WITH THE GRAND JURY. THEY'RE THE ONES THAT DECIDE, IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, WHETHER A CASE SHOULD BE BROUGHT. IT'S SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE GRAND JURY THAT THE CASE CAN GO FORWARD.

25<sup>.</sup>

1

2

3

4 5

6

Ü

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 . 21

22

23

24 25 IF YOU'RE CHOSEN AS A GRAND JUROR, YOU'RE GOING TO BE HEARING, BY AND LARGE, CASES PRESENTED BY THE ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS WHO WORK IN OUR DISTRICT.

REPRESENTING THAT OFFICE IS MR. TODD ROBINSON. HE'S A VERY FINE LAWYER. I'VE KNOWN HIM FOR YEARS. HE'S A FINE TRIAL LAWYER, VERY SMART FELLOW.

AND WHO'S BEEN WITH THE U.S.

ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR SOME TIME, ALSO, SHE'S THE GRAND JURY

ASSISTANT. YOU'LL BE GETTING TO KNOW HER IN WORKING WITH HER.

AND THEN WHOSE OUR JURY
ADMINISTRATOR

AND THEN FINALLY I THINK MOST OF YOU HAVE MET

AND THEN THIS YOUNG WOMAN HERE, EVA OEMICK, SHE'S MY COURT REPORTER. YOU'LL SEE HER OCCASIONALLY WHEN YOU COME DOWN TO RETURN GRAND JURY INDICTMENTS. AFTER YOU DECIDE WHICH CASES SHOULD GO FORWARD, USUALLY THE FOREPERSON OR THE DEPUTY FOREPERSON WILL COME DOWN. SOMETIMES TO MY COURT; SOMETIMES TO OTHERS. BUT THAT'S A REPORTED PROCEEDING.

SO WE'RE GLAD TO HAVE YOU HERE TODAY. THIS IS
IMPORTANT SERVICE, AND WE APPRECIATE YOU BEING HERE. THE MOST
FAMILIAR RESPONSE I GET FROM FOLKS CALLED IN FOR JURY SERVICE
OR GRAND JURY SERVICE IS "I WISH I WAS SOMEWHERE ELSE."

AND I UNDERSTAND THE SENTIMENT. WE ALL LEAD VERY BUSY LIVES. THIS IS REALLY IMPORTANT SERVICE. IT'S LIKE

TRIAL JURY SERVICE. I TELL OUR TRIAL JURORS THAT IF YOU WERE IN THE POSITION OF A DEFENDANT IN A CASE OR A PLAINTIFF IN A CIVIL CASE OR EVEN THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT,

MR. ROBINSON'S POSITION, YOU'D WANT THE CASE TO BE DECIDED BY PEOPLE WHO HAVE A STAKE IN THE COMMUNITY, PEOPLE WHO ARE FAIR-MINDED, PEOPLE WHO ARE CONSCIENTIOUS. THAT'S WHAT OUR JURY SYSTEM IS ABOUT. OUR GRAND JURY SYSTEM DEPENDS ON THAT AS WELL. WE WANT FAIR-MINDED PEOPLE TO MAKE THESE VERY IMPORTANT DECISIONS.

SO WHILE I ACKNOWLEDGE AND I UNDERSTAND THAT YOU LEAD VERY BUSY LIVES, WE APPRECIATE THE COMMITMENT THAT YOU MAKE. OUR SYSTEM DEPENDS ON IT. AT SOME POINT, IF YOU COUNT ON THE SYSTEM TO GIVE YOU JUSTICE, THEN YOU MUST BE PREPARED TO MAKE THIS KIND OF COMMITMENT WHEN CALLED UPON TO DO IT. SO AGAIN, I APPRECIATE YOU BEING HERE.

THAT SAID, WE'VE TRIED TO SCREEN THOSE PEOPLE
PREVIOUSLY WHO, IN THEIR QUESTIONNAIRES, TOLD US THAT THEY HAD
INSURMOUNTABLE PROBLEMS THAT WOULD PREVENT THEM FROM SERVING.
MY EXPERIENCE IS THAT BETWEEN THE TIME WE GET THE
QUESTIONNAIRES AND THE SESSION TODAY, THE SESSION WHERE WE
ACTUALLY SPEAK TO PEOPLE PERSONALLY, THAT SOMETIMES THERE'S
SOME ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS THAT ARISE THAT WEREN'T FORESEEN AND
WEREN'T KNOWN AT THE TIME ALL OF YOU FILLED OUT THE
QUESTIONNAIRES.

MADAM CLERK, IF YOU'LL CALL THE FIRST 23 NAMES.

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

Case 3:07-cr 00491 BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 9 of 69

Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 10 of 69

### SERVED AS A FEDERAL GRAND JUROR IN '99, I BELIEVE. 2 THE COURT: HERE IN THIS DISTRICT? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES. THE COURT: YOU'RE A VETERAN. YOU KNOW ALL ABOUT 5 THIS PROCESS. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: CORRECT. 7 YES, I CAN FAIR. 8 THE COURT: ARE YOU UP TO THE TASK? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES. 10 THE COURT: . I THINK IT MIGHT BE INTERESTING TO THE OTHER ASSEMBLED PEOPLE WHO HAVE NOT BEEN ON A GRAND JURY 11 12 BEFORE, DID YOU ENJOY YOUR PRIOR SERVICE? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I DID. 14 THE COURT: INTERESTING? LEARNED A LOT OF THINGS? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES. 16 THE COURT: MOST PEOPLE WHO'VE SERVED ON THE GRAND JURY TELL ME IT'S ONE OF THE BEST LEARNING EXPERIENCES OF 17 18 THEIR LIFE. THEY MEET INTERESTING PEOPLE. THEY DEAL WITH 19 INTERESTING ISSUES. 20 THANK YOU. I APPRECIATE YOUR ANSWERS. WELCOME 21 BACK. 22 I. LIVE IN 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 24 I'M A REGISTERED NURSE. I'M MARRIED, 25 AND MY HUSBAND IS A I HAVE ADULT CHILD

1	WHO'S IN HIS I HAVE
2	EXPERIENCE AS A TRIAL JUROR IN MY MID-20'S. I COULD BE FAIR
3	IF SELECTED FOR A GRAND JURY.
4	THE COURT: YOU WERE IN YOUR MID-20'S OR YOU'VE
5	HEARD 25 CASES?
· 6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I WAS IN MY MID-20'S. A LONG
7 ·	TIME AGO.
. 8	THE COURT: I ASKED ABOUT THE
. 9 <sub>.</sub>	DIFFERENCE. ALL OF YOU, OF COURSE, HAVE SEEN THE ORIENTATION
10	TAPE ABOUT THE FUNCTION OF THE GRAND JURY.
. 11	YOU APPRECIATE THE DIFFERENCE IN THE FUNCTION
12	BETWEEN THE TWO ENTITIES, TRIAL JURIES AND GRAND JURIES?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES.
14	THE COURT: YOU CAN CONSCIENTIOUSLY FULFILL THE JOB
15	OF BEING A GRAND JUROR SHOULD YOU BE ACCEPTED TO SIT ON THIS
16	PANEL?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES, I CAN.
18	THE COURT: GOOD MORNING.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: GOOD MORNING.
20	MY NAME IS FEIVE IN
21	RETIRED NOW SINCE JUNE OF LAST YEAR. I WAS A PRINCIPAL
22	RESEARCH TECHNICIAN FOR
23	YEARS. MY WIFE IS A WE DON'T HAVE ANY
24	CHILDREN. AND I WAS ON A CIVIL REAL ESTATE TRIAL FOR A COUPLE

OF WEEKS MAYBE 10 OR 12 YEARS AGO. AND I CAN BE FAIR.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: AS YOU'VE HEARD ME ALLUDE TO, THE GRAND JURY FUNCTION IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THERE'S ENOUGH EVIDENCE FOR A CASE TO GO FORWARD FOR A FULL-BLOWN TRIAL. THAT'S A PRELIMINARY DECISION IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROCESS, BUT IT'S AN IMPORTANT DECISION. SOMETIMES THE POWER TO CHARGE SOMEBODY TO BRING AN INDICTMENT AGAINST SOMEBODY IS THE POWER TO RUIN SOMEBODY. SO WE WANT YOU TO LOOK AT THE CASES CAREFULLY AND ANSWER THE TWO QUESTIONS THAT I MENTIONED TO "DO I HAVE A REASONABLE BELIEF THAT A FEDERAL CRIME WAS COMMITTED? AND DO I HAVE A REASONABLE BELIEF, BASED ON THE PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE SO FAR, THAT THIS PERSON THEY WANT ME TO INDICT HAD SOMETHING TO DO WITH THAT, EITHER COMMITTED IT OR HELPED IN THE COMMISSION OF THE CRIME?" CAN YOU MAKE DECISIONS SUCH AS THAT IF YOU WERE IMPANELED AS A GRAND JUROR HERE? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES. THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING. TELL US ABOUT YOURSELF. PROSPECTIVE JUROR:

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'M . I LIVE IN

I WORK AS A SPEECH PATHOLOGIST. I'M NOT MARRIED. I

DON'T HAVE ADULT CHÎLDREN. I'VE BEEN ON THREE TRIAL JURIES

ACROSS THE STREET.

THE COURT: WHAT WAS YOUR MOST RECENT TRIAL JURY

Ca	se 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 13 of 69
	12
•	
1	SERVICE, HOW LONG AGO?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: IN THE '80S.
3	AND I COULD BE A FAIR JUROR.
4	THE COURT: YOU MAKE THAT STATEMENT MINDFUL OF THE
. 5	QUESTIONS THAT I'VE PUT TO THE OTHER PROSPECTIVE GRAND JURORS?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES.
7	THE COURT: THANK YOU,
8	GOOD MORNING.
.9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS
10	LIVE IN I'M A PRINCIPAL FOR AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.
11	I'M MARRIED, AND MY SPOUSE A I HAVE ADULT
12	SHE IS I'VE SERVED AS A TRIAL JUROR
13	IN THE STATE COURT IN THE '80S. AND YES, I CAN BE FAIR.
14	THE COURT: DOES YOUR
15	
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES. SHE'S
17	THE COURT:
. 18	WHAT IS THE NATURE OF HER
19	
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
21	THE COURT: THANK YOU,
	THE COURT: THANK TOU,
22	
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS
24	I WORK FOR THE POST OFFICE. I'M MARRIED. MY
25	HUSBAND'S MY I ONLY HAVE AND HE

### Case 3:07-cr-00491 BTM - Document 18 - Filed 07/30/2007 - Page 14 of 69 13 WORKS FOR THE I HAVE NO EXPERIENCE. YES, I CAN 1 2 BE FAIR. 3 THE COURT: THANK YOU, 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS I'M A NURSE. I'M MARRIED TO 6 I HAVE CHILDREN, AND I'VE NEVER HAD ANY EXPERIENCE AS A TRIAL JUROR. 8 9. THE COURT: YOU WATCHED OUR ORIENTATION FILM THIS 10 MORNING AND HAVE IN MIND THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE FUNCTION 11 OF THE GRAND JURY AND THE FUNCTION OF THE TRIAL JURY? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES. 13 THE COURT: YOU'RE PREPARED TO SERVE THE FUNCTION OF 14 A GRAND JUROR? . . 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'LL TRY. 16 THE COURT: THANK YOU, 17 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: HI. MY NAME IS 19 I LIVE IN I'M A SERVICE FOR THE SOCIAL SECURITY 20 ADMINISTRATION. I'M NOT MARRIED, BUT I'LL BE GETTING MARRIED 21 IN APRIL. I DON'T HAVE ANY CHILDREN. I DON'T HAVE ANY EXPERIENCE AS A TRIAL JUROR. 22 AND YES, I WILL BE FAIR. 23 THE COURT: THANK YOU. 24 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS

I HAVE CHILDREN THAT THINK THEY'RE ADULTS, BUT THE OLDEST IS REALLY I'VE BEEN ON THREE SUPERIOR COURT TRIALS. AND I'M SURE I CAN FAIR AS A GRAND JUROR.

THE COURT: THE PRESENTATION OF

EVIDENCE TO THE GRAND JURY IS NECESSARILY ONE-SIDED. THAT'S

WHAT THE SYSTEM CONTEMPLATES. YOU'RE GOING TO BE HEARING ONLY

FROM THE PROSECUTOR. THE PROSECUTOR IS GOING TO BE PRESENTING

EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED CHARGE.

THERE'S A LATER OPPORTUNITY, IF AN INDICTMENT IS
RETURNED, FOR THE PERSON TO DEFEND HIMSELF OR HERSELF AND
PRESENT HIS OR HER SIDE OF THE CASE, CONFRONT THE ACCUSERS AND
THE WITNESSES AGAINST HIM.

BUT I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU'RE PREPARED FOR THAT SITUATION; THAT YOU'RE GOING TO BE HEARING JUST ONE SIDE, AND YOU'RE GOING TO BE ASKED TO MAKE A DECISION BASED ON THE PROSECUTOR'S EVIDENCE ALONE.

YOU'RE PREPARED FOR THAT; RIGHT?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I UNDERSTAND THAT.

THE COURT: THAT'S ONE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FULL ADVERSARY SYSTEM OF A JURY TRIAL
AND THEN OUR GRAND JURY PROCEEDING.

NOW, HAVING TOLD YOU THAT, MY EXPERIENCE IS THAT THE PROSECUTORS DON'T PLAY HIDE-THE-BALL. IF THERE'S SOMETHING

3"

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21

22

23

### Cape 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 16 of 69

ADVERSE OR THAT CUTS AGAINST THE CHARGE, YOU'LL BE INFORMED OF THAT. THEY HAVE A DUTY TO DO THAT.

BUT THAT'S NOT TO SAY THAT EVERY CHARGE WILL PASS
MUSTER. THAT'S UP TO YOU AND YOUR FELLOW GRAND JURORS.

UNDERSTANDING THAT THAT'S THE TASK OF THE GRAND

JURY, I TAKE IT YOU'RE UP TO IT?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I BELIEVE SO.

THE COURT: THANK YOU.

## 

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS

I LIVE IN SAN DIEGO IN THE MISSION HILLS AREA. I'M RETIRED.

I WAS A CLINICAL SOCIAL WORKER. I'M SINGLE. NO CHILDREN.

I'VE BEEN CALLED FOR JURY SERVICE A NUMBER OF TIMES, BUT I'VE

NEVER ACTUALLY BEEN SELECTED AS A JUROR. CAN I BE FAIR? I'LL

TRY. BECAUSE OF THE NATURE OF THE WORK THAT I DID, I HAVE

SOME FAIRLY STRONG OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE PEOPLE WHO COME

INTO THE LEGAL SYSTEM. BUT I WOULD TRY TO WORK WITH THAT.

THE COURT: WE'RE ALL PRODUCTS OF OUR EXPERIENCE.

WE'RE NOT GOING TO TRY TO DISABUSE YOU OF EXPERIENCES OR

JUDGMENTS THAT YOU HAVE. WHAT WE ASK IS THAT YOU NOT ALLOW

THOSE TO CONTROL INVARIABLY THE OUTCOME OF THE CASES COMING IN

FRONT OF YOU; THAT YOU LOOK AT THE CASES FRESH, YOU EVALUATE

THE CIRCUMSTANCES, LISTEN TO THE WITNESS TESTIMONY, AND THEN

MAKE AN INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT.

DO YOU THINK YOU CAN DO THAT?

. 1

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'LL DO MY BEST.

· 9

THE COURT: IS THERE A CERTAIN CATEGORY OF CASE THAT YOU THINK MIGHT BE TROUBLESOME FOR YOU TO SIT ON THAT YOU'D BE INSTINCTIVELY TILTING ONE WAY IN FAVOR OF INDICTMENT OR THE OTHER WAY AGAINST INDICTING JUST BECAUSE OF THE NATURE OF THE CASE?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: WELL, I HAVE SOME FAIRLY STRONG
FEELINGS REGARDING DRUG CASES. I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT ANY
DRUGS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ILLEGAL, AND I THINK WE'RE SPENDING
A LOT OF TIME AND ENERGY PERSECUTING AND PROSECUTING CASES
WHERE RESOURCES SHOULD BE DIRECTED IN OTHER AREAS.

I ALSO HAVE STRONG FEELINGS ABOUT IMMIGRATION CASES.

AGAIN, I THINK WE'RE SPENDING A LOT OF TIME PERSECUTING PEOPLE

THAT WE SHOULD NOT BE.

THE COURT: WELL, LET ME TELL YOU, YOU'VE HIT ON THE TWO TYPES OF CASES THAT ARE REALLY KIND OF THE STAPLE OF THE WORK WE DO HERE IN THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA. AS I MENTIONED IN MY INITIAL REMARKS, OUR PROXIMITY TO THE BORDER KIND OF MAKES US A FUNNEL FOR BOTH DRUG CASES AND IMMIGRATION CASES. YOU'RE GOING TO BE HEARING THOSE CASES I CAN TELL YOU FOR SURE. JUST AS DAY FOLLOWS NIGHT, YOU'RE HEAR CASES LIKE THAT.

NOW, THE QUESTION IS CAN YOU FAIRLY EVALUATE THOSE CASES? JUST AS THE DEFENDANT ULTIMATELY IS ENTITLED TO A FAIR TRIAL AND THE PERSON THAT'S ACCUSED IS ENTITLED TO A FAIR

Caşe 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 18 of 69

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: CORRECT.

BUSINESS. WE ARE ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING COMPONENTS FOR
WE'VE BEEN IN BUSINESS ABOUT
YEARS NOW. WE'RE DOING REALLY WELL. HE FREAKED OUT WHEN HE
TOLD ME I SHOULD JUST TELL YOU I SEE GUILTY PEOPLE.

THE COURT: OH, I SAY THROUGH THE PHONY EXCUSES. YOU THINK OTHERS HAVEN'T TRIED THAT BEFORE.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'M SURE THEY HAVE.

WE'VE BEEN MARRIED 31 YEARS. I HAVE TWO ADULT
CHILDREN. ONE'S A AND THE OTHER ONE'S A
STUDENT AT IN IT'S MY FIRST COURT
APPEARANCE. AND I THINK I CAN BE FAIR.

THE COURT: I THINK YOU'LL ACTUALLY ENJOY IT, AND I HOPE YOU'LL BE ABLE TO ACCOMMODATE YOUR WORK SCHEDULE HELPING YOUR HUSBAND WITH THAT.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'M KIND OF CONCERNED ABOUT OUR SCHEDULE.

THE COURT: MOST PEOPLE FIND A WAY TO WORK IT OUT.

WE HEAR OFTEN "WELL, I'M SELF-EMPLOYED. THIS IS GOING TO BE A

TREMENDOUS FINANCIAL BURDEN."

HERE'S WHAT I'M BUFFETED BY AS THE PERSON CHARGED WITH MAKING THE DECISIONS: THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES THAT JURIES, TRIAL JURIES AND GRAND JURIES, BE DRAWN FROM A FAIR

. 4

.19

Ź3.

AND ACCURATE CROSS-SECTION OF THE COMMUNITY. AND WHAT THE COURTS HAVE SAID OVER THE YEARS IS NO GROUP IS AUTOMATICALLY EXCLUDED. YOU'VE GOT TO LOOK AT EVERYBODY. AND THE EXCUSES HAVE TO BE ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS.

AS YOU CAN IMAGINE, IF I EXCUSED EVERYONE WHO HAD FINANCIAL HARDSHIP OR WAS SELF-EMPLOYED, THEN WE WOULD SKEW OUR JURY POOLS. WE WOULD HAVE WHOLE SEGMENTS OF OUR COMMUNITY HERE THAT WERE NOT REPRESENTED, AND THAT WOULDN'T BE CONSISTENT WITH THE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES.

AND SO I'M THE GUY AT THE FLOODGATE WITH THE BIG
WHEEL TRYING TO TURN IT AND MAKE THE DECISIONS. I SAY THAT
RELUCTANTLY BECAUSE I'M NOT UNMINDFUL AT ALL OF THE BURDEN IT
PLACES ON NOT ONLY SELF-EMPLOYED PEOPLE, BUT PEOPLE WITH
REGULAR FULL-TIME JOBS THAT ARE GOING TO BE AWAY FOR A PERIOD
OF TIME.

WE DO APPRECIATE YOUR SERVICE. IT'S IMPORTANT SERVICE. YOU SAY THIS IS YOUR FIRST TIME HERE. IF YOU WERE EVER HERE IN SOME OTHER CAPACITY, WITH LITIGATION OF SOME TYPE, WHETHER CIVIL OR CRIMINAL, YOU WOULD WANT CONSCIENTIOUS PEOPLE FROM THE COMMUNITY. THAT'S THE GUARANTEE THAT WE TRY TO GIVE; IS THAT "WE'RE GOING TO GIVE YOU A JUST DECISION, AND IT WILL BE A JURY OF YOUR PEERS, PEOPLE JUST LIKE YOU FROM OUR COMMUNITY WHO WILL MAKE THE DECISION. WE CAN'T CONTINUE TO GIVE THAT GUARANTEE UNLESS WE HAVE PEOPLE WILLING TO SERVE.

I THANK YOU. I APPRECIATE THE SACRIFICE. WELCOME.

C	a <del>pe 3:07-cr 00491-BTM - Document 18 - Filed 07/30/2007 - Page 21 of 69</del>
	20
1	WE'RE GLAD TO HAVE YOU.
. 2	IL CLAD TO HAVE 100.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS
ج 4	The state of the s
5	THE HARRIED. MI
. 6	WIFE IS A I HAVE ADULT CHILDREN. MY
7	WORKING
8	
9	AND I HAVE ONCE BEEN A TRIAL JUROR ABOUT 15 YEARS AGO.
10	THE COURT: CRIMINAL OR CIVIL?
. 11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: CIVIL CASE.
12	AND I COULD BE FAIR.
13	THE COURT: YOU MAKE THAT STATEMENT MINDFUL OF THE
14	QUESTIONS I'VE PUT TO OTHERS AND THE ANSWERS THAT THEY'VE GIVEN?
15	
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES.
1.7	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
18	PROCEDURATIVE TUROR
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I LIVE IN
20	I'M AN ENGINEER FOR THE
21	INSTABL AND MAINTAIN
22	I'M NOT MARRIED. I HAVE NO CHILDREN.
23	I HAVE NOT SERVED ON A JURY BEFORE.
24	THE COURT: ANY TYPE OF JURY?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: ANY TYPE OF JURY.
23	I HOPE I CAN BE FAIR.

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

1 THE COURT: I THINK YOU CAN BE FAIR. 2 THE QUESTION IS JUST A TIME PROBLEM; RIGHT? 3 THE DEFENDANT: YES, SIR. 4 THE COURT: DOESN'T HAVE TO DO WITH FAIRLY --5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: NO, SIR. THE COURT: I SPOKE TO YOU AT SIDEBAR ABOUT THAT. 6 IF IT BECOMES A PROBLEM, WE CAN DEAL WITH IT. I'LL REVISIT IT 7 . 8 AT SOME LATER TIME. 9 BUT I THINK THE EXPLANATION I GAVE TO 10 WOULD APPLY IN YOUR CASE. I CAN'T JUST SUMMARILY SAY, "WELL, THIS FELLOW'S GOT A TIME PROBLEM, SO WE'VE GOT TO LET HIM GO." 11 12 WHERE'S YOUR DUTY STATION HERE? WHERE'S YOUR 13 WORKPLACE? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 15 THE COURT: THANK YOU. I APPRECIATE YOUR ANSWERS. 16 17 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS LIVE IN I'M A STATISTICIAN AT 19 20 I'M SEPARATED RIGHT NOW. I HAVE TWO CHILDREN. I'VE BEEN ON A TRIAL JURY ON A CRIMINAL CASE AT THE 21 22. SUPERIOR COURT ABOUT TWO YEARS AGO. AND I CAN BE FAIR. 23 . THE COURT: YOU WATCHED THE FILM AND APPRECIATE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE FUNCTION OF THE GRAND JURY AND THEN 24 WHAT A CRIMINAL TRIAL JURY DOES? 25.

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

MONTHS. MOST OF MY STUFF HAS BEEN IN THE 1 AREA. NOW I'M OVER BY DRIVING. I DRIVE 2 3 SPECIAL NEEDS CHILDREN. THE COURT: IT'S BEEN A WHILE SINCE MY KIDS WERE 5 I TOOK THEM TO SNOW. SMALL. IS UP IN THE MOUNTAINS; RIGHT? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: JUST ABOVE WHERE THE 7 8 FIRE WAS. 9 THE COURT: OH. I'M THINKING WAY FARTHER EAST AND COLDER THAN 10 11 YOU'RE NOT DRIVING OUT IN THE SNOW DURING THE 12 WINTER, ARE YOU? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: NONE OF THE 14 SCHOOLS. 15 AND I'VE NEVER BEEN ON A JURY AT ALL. I THINK I CAN DO ALL THIS. 16 17 THE COURT: YOU HAVE NO RESERVATION ABOUT YOUR 18 ABILITY TO BE FAIR AND IMPARTIAL AND LOOK AT THE EVIDENCE AND 19 PERFORM THE FUNCTION THAT THE GRAND JURY PERFORMS. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: NO, SIR. THE COURT: 21 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS 23 I WORK AS A SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST. I'M AT THE 24 SCHOOL DISTRICT. I AM MARRIED. MY HUSBAND IS A 25 SO NOW HE

### Case 3:07-cr 00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 25 of 69

ADULT STEPCHILDREN. ONE IS AN AND ONE

IS IN IN I SERVED AS A TRIAL JUROR IN VISTA MAYBE

TEN YEARS AGO NOW. AND YES, I CAN BE FAIR.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. I APPRECIATE YOUR ANSWERS.

<sub>=</sub> 24

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS I'M

FROM I'M A HOMEMAKER. MY HUSBAND IS A

OUR I'VE NEVER BEEN SELECTED

FOR A JURY, ALTHOUGH I WAS CALLED. AND I THINK I CAN BE FAIR.

THE COURT: WERE YOU CALLED UP TO VISTA? IS THAT

11 WHERE YOU WOULD REPORT?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES.

THE COURT:

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MAY NAME IS

LIVE IN

I'M A REAL ESTATE AGENT. NOT MARRIED. NO

KIDS. HAVE NOT SERVED. AND AS FAR AS BEING FAIR, IT KIND OF

DEPENDS UPON WHAT THE CASE IS ABOUT BECAUSE THERE IS A

DISPARITY BETWEEN STATE AND FEDERAL LAW.

THE COURT: IN WHAT REGARD?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: SPECIFICALLY, MEDICAL

MARIJUANA.

THE COURT: WELL, THOSE THINGS -- THE CONSEQUENCES
OF YOUR DETERMINATION SHOULDN'T CONCERN YOU IN THE SENSE THAT
PENALTIES OR PUNISHMENT, THINGS LIKE THAT -- WE TELL TRIAL
JURORS, OF COURSE, THAT THEY CANNOT CONSIDER THE PUNISHMENT OR

25

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE CONSEQUENCE THAT CONGRESS HAS SET FOR THESE THINGS. WE'D 1 2 ASK YOU TO ALSO ABIDE BY THAT. WE WANT YOU TO MAKE A BUSINESS-LIKE DECISION AND LOOK AT THE FACTS AND MAKE A DETERMINATION OF WHETHER THERE WAS A PROBABLE CAUSE. COULD YOU DO THAT? COULD YOU PUT ASIDE STRONG 5 6 PERSONAL FEELINGS YOU MAY HAVE? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: IT DEPENDS. I HAVE A VERY STRONG OPINION ON IT. WE LIVE IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, NOT 8 9 FEDERAL CALIFORNIA. THAT'S HOW I FEEL ABOUT IT VERY STRONGLY. 10 THE COURT: WELL, I DON'T KNOW HOW OFTEN MEDICAL 11 MARIJUANA USE CASES COME UP HERE. I DON'T HAVE A GOOD FEEL 12 FOR THAT. MY INSTINCT IS THEY PROBABLY DON'T ARISE VERY OFTEN. BUT I SUPPOSE ONE OF THE SOLUTIONS WOULD BE IN A CASE 13 14 IMPLICATING MEDICAL USE OF MARIJUANA, YOU COULD RECUSE 15 YOURSELF FROM THAT CASE. 16 ARE YOU WILLING TO DO THAT? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: SURE. 18 THE COURT: ALL OTHER CATEGORIES OF CASES YOU COULD 19 GIVE A FAIR, CONSCIENTIOUS JUDGMENT ON? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: FOR THE MOST PART, BUT I ALSO 21

FEEL THAT DRUGS SHOULD BE LEGAL.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: OUR LAWS ARE DIFFERENT FROM THAT. AND AS YOU HEARD ME EXPLAIN TO A LOT OF THE CASES THAT COME THROUGH IN OUR COURT ARE DRUG CASES. YOU'LL BE CALLED UPON TO EVALUATE THOSE CASES OBJECTIVELY AND THEN MAKE

### Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 27 of 69

THE TWO DETERMINATIONS THAT I STARTED OFF EXPLAINING TO

"DO I HAVE A REASONABLE BELIEF THAT A CRIME WAS

COMMITTED? WHETHER I AGREE WITH WHETHER IT OUGHT TO BE A

CRIME OR NOT, DO I BELIEVE THAT A CRIME WAS COMMITTED AND THAT

THE PERSON THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS ASKING ME TO INDICT WAS

SOMEHOW INVOLVED IN THIS CRIME, EITHER COMMITTED IT OR HELPED

COULD YOU DO THAT IF YOU SIT AS A GRAND JUROR?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THE LAST JURY I WAS ASKED TO SIT
ON, I GOT EXCUSED BECAUSE OF THAT REASON.

THE COURT: YOU SAID YOU COULDN'T DO IT? YOUR SENTIMENTS ARE SO STRONG THAT THEY WOULD IMPAIR YOUR OBJECTIVITY ABOUT DRUG CASES?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I THINK RAPISTS AND MURDERERS OUGHT TO GO TO JAIL, NOT PEOPLE USING DRUGS.

THE COURT: I THINK RAPISTS AND MURDERERS OUGHT TO
GO TO JAIL, TOO. IT'S NOT FOR ME AS A JUDGE TO SAY WHAT THE
LAW IS. WE ELECT LEGISLATORS TO DO THAT. WE'RE SORT OF AT
THE END OF THE PIPE ON THAT. WE'RE CHARGED WITH ENFORCING THE
LAWS THAT CONGRESS GIVES US:

I CAN TELL YOU SOMETIMES I DON'T AGREE WITH SOME OF THE LEGAL DECISIONS THAT ARE INDICATED THAT I HAVE TO MAKE.

BUT MY ALTERNATIVE IS TO VOTE FOR SOMEONE DIFFERENT, VOTE FOR SOMEONE THAT SUPPORTS THE POLICIES I SUPPORT AND GET THE LAW CHANGED. IT'S NOT FOR ME TO SAY, "WELL, I DON'T LIKE IT. SO

1.5

WITH IT?"

I'M NOT GOING TO FOLLOW IT HERE."

YOU'D HAVE A SIMILAR OBLIGATION AS A GRAND JUROR EVEN THOUGH YOU MIGHT HAVE TO GRIT YOUR TEETH ON SOME CASES. PHILOSOPHICALLY, IF YOU WERE A MEMBER OF CONGRESS, YOU'D VOTE AGAINST, FOR EXAMPLE, CRIMINALIZING MARIJUANA. I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S IT, BUT YOU'D VOTE AGAINST CRIMINALIZING SOME DRUGS.

THAT'S NOT WHAT YOUR PREROGATIVE IS HERE. YOUR
PREROGATIVE INSTEAD IS TO ACT LIKE A JUDGE AND TO SAY, "ALL
RIGHT. THIS IS WHAT I'VE GOT TO DEAL WITH OBJECTIVELY. DOES
IT SEEM TO ME THAT A CRIME WAS COMMITTED? YES. DOES IT SEEM
TO ME THAT THIS PERSON'S INVOLVED? IT DOES." AND THEN YOUR
OBLIGATION, IF YOU FIND THOSE THINGS TO BE TRUE, WOULD BE TO
VOTE IN FAVOR OF THE CASE GOING FORWARD.

I CAN UNDERSTAND IF YOU TELL ME "LOOK, I GET ALL THAT, BUT I JUST CAN'T DO IT OR I WOULDN'T DO IT." I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOUR FRAME OF MIND IS. YOU HAVE TO TELL ME ABOUT THAT.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'M NOT COMFORTABLE WITH IT.

THE COURT: DO YOU THINK YOU'D BE INCLINED TO LET PEOPLE GO ON DRUG CASES EVEN THOUGH YOU WERE CONVINCED THERE WAS PROBABLE CAUSE THEY COMMITTED A DRUG OFFENSE?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: IT WOULD DEPEND UPON THE CASE.

THE COURT: IS THERE A CHANCE THAT YOU WOULD DO

THAT?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES.

	The state of the s	МҮ 🦠	BOYS	WOR	K FOR	THE ,	inning has been to all a constant and the ball to	I	1 .	
			AND T	HEY V	VORK	FOR A	COMPANY	WHERE	THEY	GO
INTO	THE THE			ÀND	THE		то	COPY OF	F 🚺	
RECO	RDS:									

THE COURT: THEY BOTH HAVE THE SAME JOB, SAME JOB FUNCTIONS?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES. WELL, ACTUALLY, MY OLDER BOY HAD THIS JOB FOR -- HE'S BEEN WORKING FOR THE COMPANY FOR A LONG TIME.

THE COURT: TOLD HIS BROTHER "THIS IS A GOOD GIG"?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YEAH. HIS BROTHER WAS WORKING

IN FOR A WHILE. THEN THE JOB OPENED UP, AND MY

YOUNGER ONE NOW IS WORKING THERE. HE GOES ALSO ALL OVER

THE COURT: WHERE'S THE OLDER BROTHER?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THE OLDER BROTHER NOW IS IN THINGS WERE A LITTLE BIT BETTER FOR HIM TO GROW AND BE ABLE TO BUY A HOME. SO HE'S OVER THERE WITH HIS WIFE AND TWO KIDS.

I HAVE BEEN ON A JURY BEFORE FOR FEDERAL IN 1980

MAYBE. A LONG, LONG TIME AGO. I'VE BEEN CALLED FOR SUPERIOR

COURT IN EL CAJON AND HERE IN SAN DIEGO.

THE COURT: DID YOU WATCH OUR ORIENTATION FILM THIS
MORNING AND APPRECIATE THE DIFFERENCE IN FUNCTIONS BETWEEN
GRAND JURIES AND TRIAL JURIES?

2<sub>.</sub>3

10.

Document 15-3

Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 31 of 69

Filed 02/15/2008

Page 65 of 103

Case 3:08-cr-00211-BTM

#### Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 32 of 69 31 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES, I FOUND THAT OUT WHEN I GOT 1 2 HERE. 3 THE COURT: IF THE DRIVE'S NOT GOING TO BE A 4 PROBLEM, YOU'RE HAPPY TO SERVE? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I CAN SERVE, YES. 6 THE COURT: WE'RE HAPPY TO HAVE YOU HERE. 7 THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, LADIES AND 8 GENTLEMEN, COMPRISES BOTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY -- AND MOST OF US 9 ARE FROM SAN DIEGO COUNTY -- AND ALSO IMPERIAL COUNTY. WE TRY 10 TO PULL RANDOMLY BUT SYSTEMATICALLY FROM IMPERIAL COUNTY, TOO. IT'S NOT OUT OF THE ORDINARY. IT'S A LITTLE UNUSUAL THAT I'LL 11 12 GET MORE THAN ONE OR TWO IMPERIAL COUNTY PROSPECTIVE JURORS 13 EVEN ON A TRIAL JURY. BUT WE'RE HAPPY TO HAVE YOU, TEN-GALLON HAT AND ALL. 14 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS LIVE IN THE 1.7 I'M RETIRED. I'VE 18 BEEN RETIRED FOR SIX YEARS. 19 THE COURT: WHAT KIND OF WORK DID YOU DO? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I WAS IN THE PRINTING INDUSTRY 2.1 YEARS. MY WIFE IS 22 WE HAVE CHILDREN: TWO OF THEM LIVE 23 THE OTHER IS A 24 25 AND MY OTHER LIVES IN

1 SHE'S A 2 THE COURT: DID THE SHOWER 3 LIVED AT HOME? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: STILL SINGS IN THE SHOWER. 4 5 AND I'VE BEEN CALLED A FEW TIMES, BUT HAVE NOT 6 SERVED ON ANY JURIES. AND I CERTAINLY CAN BE FAIR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, WE'RE HAPPY 7 8 TO HAVE YOU. FINALLY, 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS 10 11 I'M AN ACTIVE REAL ESTATE BROKER. MY WIFE IS WE HAVE ADULT CHILDREN: 12 13 ARE MARRIED, AND ONE'S A 14 HAVE NO EXPERIENCE AS A JUROR. HOWEVER, I HAVE SERVED AS A 15 WITNESS FOR THE GRAND JURY. 16 THE COURT: YOU'VE ACTUALLY BEEN CALLED AS A WITNESS BEFORE A GRAND JURY? 17 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES, I HAVE. 1.9 THE COURT: HOW LONG AGO WAS THAT? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I WOULD SAY ABOUT TEN YEARS. 21 AND YES, I CAN BE FAIR. 22 THE COURT: WELL, YOU MAY KNOW FROM YOUR EXPERIENCE 23 THAT IF YOU HAVE COUNSEL AS A WITNESS, YOUR COUNSEL DOESN'T ACCOMPANY YOU IN TO THE GRAND JURY. THE HALLMARK OF THE GRAND 24 25 JURY IS THAT IT'S A SECRET PROCEEDING AND NECESSARILY SO.

. 16

. 

ź5

BECAUSE IF YOU, AS A GRAND JURY, DECIDE NO CHARGES SHOULD BE BROUGHT, THEN NO ONE'S THE WORSE FOR THE WEAR. NO ONE EVER KNOWS ABOUT THAT.

WE DO ALLOW WITNESSES TO CONSULT WITH THEIR LAWYERS,
BUT THEY MUST LEAVE THE GRAND JURY ROOM, CONSULT OUTSIDE WITH
THE LAWYER, AND THEN COME BACK IN. SO THAT'S WHAT YOU CAN
EXPECT IF THERE ARE WITNESSES WHO ARE REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: IT WAS SO SECRETIVE THAT I DIDN'T EVEN KNOW WHAT I WAS THERE FOR.

THE COURT: I'M' GOING TO TOUCH ON THAT IN MY

REMARKS. BUT IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT -- IT'S CHARACTERISTIC

OF THE GRAND JURY, AND YOU WILL BE UNDER LEGAL OBLIGATIONS NOT

TO SPEAK OF WHAT GOES ON IN FRONT OF THE GRAND JURY. THERE'S

A LOT OF INTEREST SERVED BY THAT SECRECY, AS I SAID.

ORDINARILY, EVERYTHING IS SUPPOSED TO BE

TRANSCRIBED. WE'RE SUPPOSED TO KNOW WHAT OUR GOVERNMENT IS

DOING. BUT THIS IS ONE AREA WHERE TRADITIONALLY THE COURTS

AND EVERYONE ELSE SAYS, "NO. WE NEED TO HAVE CONFIDENTIALITY

AND SECRECY HERE." I TOUCHED ON ONE OF THE REASONS WHY IT HAS

TO DO WITH NOT RUINING THE REPUTATIONS OF PEOPLE, FOR EXAMPLE,

WHO MAY BE UNDER INVESTIGATION, BUT NO CHARGES EVER RESULT.

SOMETIMES THE POWER TO INDICT SOMEONE CAN BE THE POWER TO RUIN

A REPUTATION.

THERE ARE A LOT OF OTHER GOOD REASONS WHY THE GRAND JURY HAS TO FUNCTION SECRETLY. FIRST, IT PROMOTES YOUR

. 24

SECURITY. PEOPLE WON'T KNOW THAT YOU'RE GRAND JURORS UNLESS YOU TELL THEM. A LOT OF TIMES THE CRIMES UNDER INVESTIGATION, THE GOVERNMENT IS NOT SURE YET WHETHER IT'S A CRIME. WE NEED THE HELP OF THE GRAND JURY IN ASCERTAINING WHAT'S GOING ON.

SO THEY DON'T WANT TO TIP THEIR HAND AND SAY, "WE'RE LOOKING AT SOMETHING." THEY DON'T WANT PEOPLE TO TAKE MEASURES TO COVER UP CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES.

ON OTHER OCCASIONS, SOMEONE WHO KNOWS HE'S THE
OBJECT OF AN INVESTIGATION MIGHT FLEE TO A DIFFERENT COUNTRY
AND GET OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES WHERE
THEY COULDN'T BE REACHED.

SO ALL OF THOSE REASONS AND OTHERS PROMOTE THE POLICY OF GRAND JURY SECRECY. YOU TOUCHED ON SOMETHING THAT'S VERY IMPORTANT. IT WILL BE INCUMBENT UPON ALL OF YOU TO MAINTAIN THE SECRECY OF THE GRAND JURY IF YOU TAKE THE OATH AND SERVE AS GRAND JURORS.

HOW'S THE REAL ESTATE MARKET THESE DAYS, SLOW?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: IT'S A LITTLE SLOW. I

SPECIALIZE IN INVESTMENT PROPERTIES.

THE COURT: SOME THINGS ARE HELPING, THOUGH; RIGHT?
THE MORTGAGE RATES ARE STARTING TO DROP?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THEY'VE DROPPED A LITTLE BIT.

THE COURT: THAT OUGHT TO HELP.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YEAH. THE MARKET'S STILL PRETTY HIGH HERE IN SAN DIEGO PRICE-WISE.

2

3

· 4

5

б

7

8

. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I READ WHERE PEOPLE ARE JUST STAYING
LONGER. THE SELLERS ARE NOT GIVING UP THEIR PLACES FOR LESS.
THEY JUST SAY, "WELL, WE'LL STICK IT OUT. WE'LL DIG IN OUR
HEELS AND STAY."

IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE EXPERIENCING, TOO?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES, I FIND A LOT OF THAT. WHAT YOU HAVE TO REALIZE IS THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE, IF THEY JUST BOUGHT RECENTLY AND THEY'RE TRYING TO GET OUT OR THEY BOUGHT SOME SECONDARY PROPERTY AND SO ON, THOSE ARE THE PEOPLE THAT ARE HAVING PROBLEMS.

THE COURT: THEY'RE A LITTLE BIT UNDERWATER?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: SOME OF THEM ARE, YES.

THE COURT: THANK YOU, I APPRECIATE
YOUR ANSWERS.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, HAVING SPOKEN WITH ALL OF YOU AND PASSED ON YOUR GENERAL QUALIFICATIONS TO SIT, IT'S NOW MY RESPONSIBILITY TO SELECT TWO OF YOUR NUMBER: ONE AS A FOREPERSON, THE OTHER AS A DEPUTY FOREPERSON. THE FOREPERSON PRESIDES OVER THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE GRAND JURY AND ACTS AS THE CONTACT WITH BOTH THE COURT AND THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE.

NEITHER THE FOREPERSON OR THE DEPUTY FOREPERSON HAVE
ANY GREATER SAY. IT'S THE DELIBERATIVE PROCESS. THE 23 OF
YOU ALL HAVE AN EQUAL SAY.

BUT I THINK, HAVING LISTENED TO YOUR ANSWERS AND

Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 37 of 69 36 EVALUATED YOUR BACKGROUNDS, IT APPEARS TO ME, 1 2 HAVING PRIOR GRAND JURY SERVICE, THAT YOU WOULD BE A GOOD 3 PERSON TO ACT AS THE FOREPERSON OF THE GRAND JURY. 4 ARE YOU UP TO THE TASK AND WILLING TO ACCEPT THAT 5 ASSIGNMENT? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I AM. 7 THE COURT: THE COURT WOULD THEN APPOINT 8 AS THE FOREPERSON OF THIS GRAND JURY. ARE YOU WILLING TO SERVE AS THE DEPUTY . 9. 10 FOREPERSON? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: CERTAINLY. 11 12 THE COURT: YOU WOULD BE THE PRESIDING GRAND JUROR 1,3 IN THE ABSENCE OF THOSE ARE THE DESIGNATIONS I WOULD MAKE, THEN: 14 AS FOREPERSON; . 15 16 FOREPERSON. 17 --000---18 THE CLERK: NEXT PANEL, 07-2, THIS IS THE THURSDAY 19 PANEL. 2.0 21 22 23 24 25:

#### Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM - Document 18 - Filed 07/30/2007 - Page 39 of 69

GENERALLY THAT I POSED TO THE OTHER PROSPECTIVE GRAND JURORS ABOUT THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TRIAL JURIES AND GRAND JURIES AND WHETHER INDIVIDUALS COULD FULFILL THAT FUNCTION.

38

WOULD YOUR ANSWERS HAVE BEEN BASICALLY THE SAME AS THOSE THAT I'VE BEEN GIVEN WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE TWO PEOPLE THAT HAVE BEEN EXCUSED?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES.

THE COURT:

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'M

I WORK FOR AN INSURANCE COMPANY

I'M MARRIED. MY WIFE IS A

HAVE

KIDS AGE TAND

I'VE BEEN A JUDGE BEFORE

HAVE KIDS AGE AND I'VE BEEN A JUROR BEFORE
PROBABLY TEN YEARS AGO ON KIND OF A LOW-LEVEL CRIMINAL CASE.

AND IN THE NAME OF FULL DISCLOSURE, I'D PROBABLY SUGGEST I'D
BE THE FLIPSIDE OF SOME OF THE INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE CONVEYED
THEIR CONCERNS PREVIOUSLY. I HAVE A STRONG BIAS FOR THE U.S.
ATTORNEY, WHATEVER CASES THEY MIGHT BRING. I DON'T THINK
THEY'RE HERE TO WASTE OUR TIME, THE COURT'S TIME, THEIR OWN
TIME. I APPRECIATE THE EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS, I GUESS, MORE
OR LESS, AS A LAYPERSON WOULD; THAT THEY ARE CALLED UPON IN
ORDER TO BRING THESE CASES OR SEEK AN INDICTMENT.

AND THE GATEKEEPER ROLE THAT I GUESS WE'RE BEING
ASKED TO PLAY IS ONE THAT I'D HAVE A DIFFICULT TIME, IN ALL
HONESTY. I'M PROBABLY SUGGESTING THAT THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S
CASE WOULD BE ONE THAT I WOULD BE WILLING TO STAND IN FRONT

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12.

13

14

15

16

17

18.

19:

20.

21

·24 25

OF; IN OTHER WORDS, PREVENT FROM GOING TO A JURY.

22.

THE COURT: IT SOMETIMES HAPPENS THAT AT THE TIME
THE CASE IS INITIALLY PRESENTED TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,
THINGS APPEAR DIFFERENTLY THAN 10 DAYS LATER, 20 DAYS LATER
WHEN IT'S PRESENTED TO A GRAND JURY. THAT'S WHY THIS
GATEKEEPER ROLE IS VERY, VERY IMPORTANT.

YOU'RE NOT PART OF THE PROSECUTING ARM. YOU'RE INTENDED TO BE A BUFFER INDEPENDENT OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. AND THE REAL ROLE OF THE GRAND JURY IS TO MAKE SURE THAT UNSUBSTANTIATED CHARGES DON'T GO FORWARD.

YOU'VE HEARD MY GENERAL COMMENTS. YOU HAVE AN APPRECIATION ABOUT HOW AN UNSUBSTANTIATED CHARGE COULD CAUSE PROBLEMS FOR SOMEONE EVEN IF THEY'RE ULTIMATELY ACQUITTED.

YOU APPRECIATE THAT; RIGHT?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I THINK I COULD APPRECIATE THAT, YES.

THE COURT: AND SO WE'RE -- LOOK, I'LL BE HONEST WITH YOU. THE GREAT MAJORITY OF THE CHARGES THAT THE GRAND JURY PASSES ON THAT ARE PRESENTED BY THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE DO GO FORWARD. MOST OF THE TIME, THE GRAND JURY PUTS ITS SEAL OF APPROVAL ON THE INITIAL DECISION MADE BY THE U.S. ATTORNEY.

OBVIOUSLY, I WOULD SCREEN SOMEBODY OUT WHO SAYS, "I DON'T CARE ABOUT THE EVIDENCE. I'M NOT GOING TO PAY ATTENTION TO THE EVIDENCE. IF THE U.S. ATTORNEY SAYS IT'S GOOD, I'M

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

### Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 41 of 69

GOING TO GO WITH THAT." IT DIDN'T SOUND LIKE THAT'S WHAT YOU WERE SAYING. YOU WERE SAYING YOU GIVE A PRESUMPTION OF GOOD FAITH TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY AND ASSUME, QUITE LOGICALLY, THAT THEY'RE NOT ABOUT THE BUSINESS OF TRYING TO INDICT INNOCENT PEOPLE OR PEOPLE THAT THEY BELIEVE TO BE INNOCENT OR THE EVIDENCE DOESN'T SUBSTANTIATE THE CHARGES AGAINST. THAT'S WELL AND GOOD.

YOU MUST UNDERSTAND THAT AS A MEMBER OF THE GRAND
JURY, YOU'RE THE ULTIMATE ARBITER. THEY DON'T HAVE THE
AUTHORITY TO HAVE A CASE GO FORWARD WITHOUT YOU AND FELLOW
GRAND JURORS' APPROVAL. I WOULD WANT YOU NOT TO JUST
AUTOMATICALLY DEFER TO THEM OR SURRENDER THE FUNCTION AND
GIVER THE INDICTMENT DECISION TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY. YOU HAVE
TO MAKE THAT INDEPENDENTLY.

YOU'RE WILLING TO DO THAT IF YOU'RE RETAINED HERE?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'M NOT A PERSON THAT THINKS OF

ANYBODY IN THE BACK OF A POLICE CAR AS NECESSARILY GUILTY, AND

I WOULD DO MY BEST TO GO AHEAD AND BE OBJECTIVE. BUT AGAIN,

JUST IN THE NAME OF FULL DISCLOSURE, I FELT LIKE I SHOULD LET

YOU KNOW THAT I HAVE A VERY STRONG PRESUMPTION WITH RESPECT TO

ANY DEFENDANT THAT WOULD BE BROUGHT IN FRONT OF US.

THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. LET ME
TELL YOU THE PROCESS WILL WORK MECHANICALLY. THEY'RE GOING TO
CALL WITNESSES. AND WHAT THEY'RE GOING TO ASK YOU TO DO IS
EVALUATE THE TESTIMONY YOU HEAR FROM WITNESSES.

20.

21\_

23.

BEFORE YOU REACH A POINT WHERE YOU VOTE ON ANY INDICTMENT, THE U.S. ATTORNEY AND THE STENOGRAPHER LEAVE. THE ONLY PEOPLE LEFT WHEN THE VOTE IS TAKEN ARE THE GRAND JURORS THEMSELVES. THAT'S THE WAY THE PROCESS IS GOING TO WORK.

YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE TO SAY EITHER "WELL, IT HAS THE RING OF TRUTH TO ME, AND I THINK IT HAPPENED THE WAY IT'S
BEING SUGGESTED HERE. AT LEAST I'M CONVINCED ENOUGH TO LET
THE CASE GO FORWARD" OR "THINGS JUST DON'T HAPPEN LIKE THAT IN
MY EXPERIENCE, AND I THINK THIS SOUNDS CRAZY TO ME. I WANT
EITHER MORE EVIDENCE OR I'M NOT CONVINCED BY WHAT'S BEEN
PRESENTED AND I'M NOT GOING TO LET IT GO FORWARD."

CAN YOU MAKE AN OBJECTIVE ON FACTS LIKE THE ONES I'VE JUST DESCRIBED?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I WOULD DO MY BEST TO DO THAT.

I CERTAINLY WOULD WANT ME SITTING ON A GRAND JURY IF I WERE A

DEFENDANT COMING BEFORE THIS GRAND JURY. HAVING SAID THAT, I

WOULD DO MY BEST. I HAVE TO ADMIT TO A STRONG BIAS IN FAVOR

OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY THAT I'M NOT SURE I COULD OVERCOME.

THE COURT: ALL I'M TRYING TO GET AT IS WHETHER YOU'RE GOING TO AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO INDICT IRRESPECTIVE OF THE FACTS.

A FEW YEARS AGO, I IMPANELED A FELLOW HERE THAT WAS

A SERGEANT ON THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT. AND YEARS AGO WHEN I

WAS A PROSECUTOR, I WORKED WITH HIM. HE WAS ALL ABOUT

ARRESTING AND PROSECUTING PEOPLE. BUT WHEN HE GOT HERE, HE

#### Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 43 of 69

SAID, "LOOK, I UNDERSTAND THAT THIS IS A DIFFERENT FUNCTION.

I CAN PERFORM THAT FUNCTION." HE SERVED FAITHFULLY AND WELL

FOR A NUMBER OF -- OVER A YEAR, I THINK. 18 MONTHS, MAYBE.

HE EVENTUALLY GOT A PROMOTION, SO WE RELIEVED HIM FROM THE

GRAND JURY SERVICE.

BUT, YOU KNOW, HE TOOK OFF ONE HAT AND ONE UNIFORM AND PUT ON A DIFFERENT HAT ON THE DAYS HE REPORTED TO THE GRAND JURY. HE WAS A POLICEMAN. HE'D BEEN INVOLVED IN PROSECUTING CASES. BUT HE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE FUNCTION HE WAS PERFORMING HERE WAS DIFFERENT, THAT IT REQUIRED HIM TO INDEPENDENTLY AND OBJECTIVELY ANALYZE CASES AND ASSURED ME THAT HE COULD DO THAT, THAT HE WOULD NOT AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO INDICT JUST BECAUSE THE U.S. ATTORNEY SAID SO.

AGAIN, I DON'T WANT TO PUT WORDS IN YOUR MOUTH. BUT I DON'T HEAR YOU SAYING THAT THAT'S THE EXTREME POSITION THAT YOU HAVE. I HEAR YOU SAYING INSTEAD THAT COMMON SENSE AND YOUR EXPERIENCE TELLS YOU THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S NOT GOING TO WASTE TIME ON CASES THAT LACK MERIT. THE CONSCIENTIOUS PEOPLE WHO WORK FOR THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AREN'T GOING TO TRY TO TRUMP UP PHONY CHARGES AGAINST PEOPLE.

MY ANECDOTAL EXPERIENCE SUPPORTS THAT, TOO. THAT
DOESN'T MEAN THAT EVERY CASE THAT COMES IN FRONT OF ME I SAY,
"WELL, THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S ON THIS. THE PERSON MUST BE
GUILTY." I CAN'T DO THAT. I LOOK AT THE CASES STAND-ALONE,
INDEPENDENT, AND I EVALUATE THE FACTS. I DO WHAT I'M CHARGED

.14

WITH DOING, WHICH IS MAKING A DECISION BASED ON THE EVIDENCE THAT'S PRESENTED.

SO THAT'S THE QUESTION I HAVE FOR YOU. I CAN UNDERSTAND THE DEFERENCE TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY. AND FRANKLY, I AGREE WITH THE THINGS THAT YOU'RE SAYING. THEY MAKE SENSE TO ME. BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY, YOUR OBLIGATION IS STILL TO LOOK AT THESE CASES INDEPENDENTLY AND FORM AN INDEPENDENT CONSCIENTIOUS BUSINESS-LIKE JUDGMENT ON THE TWO QUESTIONS THAT I'VE MENTIONED EARLIER: DO I HAVE A REASONABLE BELIEF THAT A CRIME WAS COMMITTED? DO I HAVE A REASONABLE BELIEF THAT THE PERSON TO BE CHARGED COMMITTED IT OR HELPED COMMIT IT?

CAN YOU DO THAT?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: AGAIN, I WOULD DO MY BEST TO DO
THAT. BUT I DO BRING A VERY, VERY STRONG BIAS. I BELIEVE
THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, THE U.S. ATTORNEY WOULD HAVE OTHER FACTS
THAT WOULD RISE TO LEVEL THAT THEY'D BE ABLE TO PRESENT TO US
THAT WOULD BEAR ON THE TRIAL. I WOULD LOOK AT THE CASE AND
PRESUME AND BELIEVE THAT THERE ARE OTHER FACTS OUT THERE THAT
AREN'T PRESENTED TO US THAT WOULD ALSO BEAR ON TAKING THE CASE
TO TRIAL. I'D HAVE A VERY DIFFICULT TIME.

THE COURT: YOU WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO DO THAT. WE WOULDN'T WANT YOU TO SPECULATE THAT THERE'S OTHER FACTS THAT HAVEN'T BEEN PRESENTED TO YOU. YOU HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION BASED ON WHAT'S BEEN PRESENTED.

BUT LOOK, I CAN TELL YOU I IMAGINE THERE'S PEOPLE IN

#### Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM - Document 18 - Filed 07/30/2007 - Page 45 of 69

THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE THAT DISAGREE WITH ONE ANOTHER

ABOUT THE MERITORIOUSNESS OF A CASE OR WHETHER A CASE CAN BE

WON AT A JURY TRIAL.

IS THAT RIGHT, MR. ROBINSON?

MR. ROBINSON: ON OCCASION, YOUR HONOR. NOT VERY OFTEN.

THE COURT: IT COMES UP EVEN IN AN OFFICE WITH

PEOPLE CHARGED WITH THE SAME FUNCTION. I DON'T WANT TO BEAT

YOU UP ON THIS, I'M EQUALLY CONCERNED WITH.

SOMEBODY WHO WOULD SAY, "I'M GOING TO AUTOMATICALLY DROP THE

TRAP DOOR ON ANYBODY THE U.S ATTORNEY ASKS." I WOULDN'T WANT

YOU TO DO THAT. IF YOU THINK THERE'S A POSSIBILITY YOU'LL DO

THAT, THEN I'D BE INCLINED TO EXCUSE YOU.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I THINK THAT THERE'S A POSSIBILITY I WOULD BE INCLINED TO DO THAT.

THE COURT: I'M GOING TO EXCUSE YOU, THEN. THANK
YOU. I APPRECIATE YOUR ANSWERS.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IF YOU'LL GIVE ME JUST A SHORT PAUSE. I'M GOING TO RECESS THIS PROCEEDING. I HAVE A JURY TRIAL OUT. THE JURY HAS SENT A QUESTION. I'M GOING TO DISCUSS HOW TO ANSWER THE QUESTION WITH COUNSEL. YOU'RE ALL WELCOME TO STAY AND LISTEN TO THIS. WE'LL BE IN RECESS MOMENTARILY.

---000--

THE COURT: NOW BACK TO THE GRAND JURY IMPANELMENT.

#### Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 47 of 69

1 WORKS FOR

THE COURT: IS HE AN

PROSPECTIVE JUROR:

HE WORKS FOR THE

46

4

5

2

3

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

16

17 :

18. 19

20

2122

23

24

25

I'VE BEEN ON TWO TRIALS: ONE WAS A MUNICIPAL COURT TRIAL. IT WASN'T CRIMINAL. MONEY WAS INVOLVED. AND THE OTHER ONE WAS A CRIMINAL. AND THE FIRST ONE WAS IN THE '80'S SOMETIME. THE LAST ONE WAS PROBABLY TEN YEARS AGO. AND YES, I CAN BE FAIR.

THE COURT: HOW'S THE GOING.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: VERY WELL.

THE COURT: WHEN I WAS STILL A COLLEGE STUDENT, WE HAD EMBARKED UPON A SPEAKERS PROGRAM. I GOT TOGETHER WITH AT AT AND WE MADE AN ARRANGEMENT WHERE THE SPEAKERS WOULD COME. AND THESE WERE THE DRAWS IN PEOPLE OF STATURE THAT HAVE SOMETHING IMPORTANT TO SAY.

SAID THAT "IF THEY'LL POSE FOR A PICTURE HERE AT THE THEN ALL THE ACCOMMODATIONS ARE ON US," WHICH WAS A GREAT ACCOMMODATION FOR OUR LITTLE TINY SPEAKERS PROGRAM. BUT THEY WOULD SPEAK AT THE COLLEGE THE NIGHT BEFORE BACK IN 1976, AND THEN THEY'D GO TO

SO I HAVE FOND MEMORIES OF THAT. PLEASE GIVE

MY REGARDS.

Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 48 of 69

47

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I WILL.

THE COURT:

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'M

EARS IN THE NAVY AS A NAVAL AVIATOR.

28 YEARS IN INDUSTRY, IN R&D, DEFENSE INDUSTRY. I'M MARRIED.

MY WIFE IS SHE DID ADULT

CHILDREN, ALL OVER 40: THEM PRODUCED CHILDREN FOR A

LIVING, I THINK. MY DAUGHTER IS IN IN I HAVE A

UP IN THE BAY AREA WHO'S IN AND ONE

IN WHO DOES FOR

ONE'S A WHO AT

12 AND THE I

13 HAVE BEEN SELECTED AND BOUNCED OFF A NUMBER OF FEDERAL AND

14 STATE JURIES, BUT I DID SERVE ON ONE CIVIL CASE IN THE

15 SUPERIOR COURT. I UNDERSTAND THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THAT

16 WORK AND THE GRAND JURY.

THE COURT: THE BASIS FOR BOUNCING YOU, WERE YOU PRO

18 | PROSECUTION OR PRO DEFENSE?

19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I THINK HALF THE TIME IT WAS

20 JUST THE MILITARY EXPERIENCE. "THE STORY IS IN COURT MARTIAL,

21 IF IT WEREN'T TRUE, THEY WOULDN'T HAVE CHARGED THEM TYPE OF

22 THING.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

. 9

10

17

25

THE COURT: YOU HEARD HE ADHERED TO THAT

24 KIND OF BELIEF IN THIS CIVILIAN PROCEEDING.

YOU'RE NOT OF THAT FRAME OF MIND?

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

# Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 49 of 69

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: NO.

THE COURT: IT'S UNFAIR TO ASK YOU WHY YOU WERE
BOUNCED. I'D HAVE TO ASK THE LAWYERS. WHEN WE PICK TRIAL
JURIES A LOT OF TIME, SOME PEOPLE -- I TALK TO PEOPLE LIKE MY
NEIGHBORS AND ALL. THEY SAY, "THEY BOUNCED ME OFF." THEY'RE
UPSET ABOUT IT. AND I TRY TO ASSUAGE THEM BY SAYING, "LOOK,
LET ME TELL YOU SOMETHING." AND THIS IS IN A TRIAL JURY
CONTEXT. "IT REALLY SAYS MORE ABOUT THE LAWYER THAN IT DOES
ABOUT YOU." BECAUSE LAWYERS HAVE THESE IDEAS OF WHO THEY WANT
ON A JURY OR WHAT THE COMPOSITION OF THE JURY OUGHT TO BE."

EVA'S HEARD ME TELL THIS STORY BEFORE. WHEN I WAS A YOUNG LAWYER TRYING CASES JUST STARTING OUT, MY RULE OF THUMB AS TO THE TEN CHALLENGES I HAD WAS NO ONE YOUNGER THAN I AM. IF THEY'RE YOUNGER THAN I AM, THEY HAVEN'T HAD TO MAKE HARD DECISIONS. THEY DON'T HAVE A SUFFICIENT STAKE IN THE COMMUNITY. I COULD RATTLE OFF THREE OR FOUR JUSTIFICATIONS FOR IT.

THE TRUTH OF THE MATTER IS I PROBABLY BOUNCED A LOT OF PEOPLE THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN FINE. IT REALLY ILLUSTRATES THE POINT THAT IT SAYS MORE ABOUT THE LAWYER THAN IT SAYS ABOUT THE PERSON BEING BOUNCED.

THANK YOU, I APPRECIATE YOUR ANSWERS.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS I'M A PRODUCTION SCHEDULER. I'M

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

. 17

· 9

23.

. 25

#### Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 50 of 69 49 MARRIED. MY WIFE 1 2 BOYS FROM TO 3 THE COURT: YOU POOR SOUL. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I HAVE NO TRIAL EXPERIENCE, AND 4 5 I COULD BE FAIR. 6 THE COURT: MY GOODNESS. 7 WHAT'S THE AGE SPAN BETWEEN YOUR BOYS? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: FROM TO THEY KEEP ME VERY 9 BUSY. THE COURT: I RAISED TWO THAT WERE TWO YEARS APART, 10 AND THAT KEPT ME RUNNING ALL THE TIME. 11 YOU HAVE HUH? 12 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: WE TRIED FOR A GIRL, AND IT 14 NEVER WORKED. 15 THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE BROTHERS AND SISTERS? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I HAVE ANOTHER BROTHER AND TWO 16 17 SISTERS. THE COURT: HIGH INCIDENCE OF BOYS IN YOUR FAMILY? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: VERY MUCH. . 19 THE COURT: DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE A LOT OF BOYS, TOO? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY SISTER HAS TO BUT MY 21 COUSINS, IT'S LIKE BOYS AND GIRLS. 22 23 THE COURT: IT MUST BE SOMETHING IN ONE'S GENETIC 24 CODE. WE HAVE TO ASK THE DOCTOR, THE GENETICIST, ABOUT IT. 25 MY FAMILY TREE RUNS THE SAME WAY, ALMOST ALL BOYS. ALLOF US

50 KNOCK OUT BOYS. I DIDN'T KEEP GOING. 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'M DONE. 2 THANK YOU, THE COURT: 3 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS 5 I'M A REGISTERED NURSE. I'M MARRIED. 6 ADULT CHILDREN. MY HUSBAND WORKS FOR . . 8 ONE IS A 9 AND ANOTHER 10 AND ONE IS A 11 I HAVE NO EXPERIENCE AS A JUROR. AND I THINK I 12 CAN BE FAIR. 13 THE COURT: YOU'RE GOING TO HEAR CASES, 14 I'M SURE, INVOLVING AGENTS 15 YOU SAID YOUR OTHER SON IS A 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: HE'S AN 17 THE COURT: ONE'S AN 18 19 IS. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 20 THE COURT: I THOUGHT YOU HAD TWO 21 22 JUST ONE? 23/ PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY HUSBAND WORKS FOR 24. 25

. 6

. 8

THE COURT: YOU'RE GOING TO BE HEARING CASES FROM

CAN YOU BE OBJECTIVE ABOUT THOSE CASES? CAN YOU LISTEN TO THE FACTS AND MAKE A STAND-ALONE DECISION ON EACH CASE WITHOUT INSTINCTIVELY SAYING, "WELL, THEY WORK FOR THE AS MY SON OR MY HUSBAND."

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I THINK I CAN BE FAIR.

THE COURT: THAT WOULD BE YOUR OBLIGATION. YOU'RE NOT AUTOMATICALLY DISQUALIFIED. AS YOU HEARD ME SAY, WE HAD A SERGEANT ON THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT THAT WAS SERVING ON ONE OF OUR GRAND JURIES. SO IT'S NOT AUTOMATICALLY DISQUALIFYING. BUT YOU HAVE TO BE ABLE TO ASSURE ME THAT "I'LL LOOK AT THESE CASES INDEPENDENTLY. I UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF ACTING AS A BUFFER BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT'S POWER TO CHARGE SOMEONE WITH A CRIME AND THEN BRINGING THEM TO TRIAL. AND I'LL FULFILL THAT FUNCTION CONSCIENTIOUSLY."

YOU CAN DO THAT?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I CAN DO THAT.

THE COURT: THANK YOU.

Sp. 10 man

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS I LIVE
IN I'M A TRAFFIC ENGINEER WITH THE

THE COURT: MAYBE YOU CAN GET THOSE TELEPHONE POLES DOWN. I HAVE A BIG POLE RIGHT ON THE LEFT SIDE. I JUST READ

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 53 of 69

## 52 IN THE PAPER THAT WE'RE GOING TO PAY MORE FOR OUR TELEPHONE 1 BILLS SO THAT THEY CAN TAKE ALL THESE POLES DOWN, AND I EXPECTED TO HEAR THAT CHAINSAWS THE NEXT MORNING. YOU CAN BET WHEN THE NEXT BLLL COMES, I'M GOING TO HAVE THE ASSESSMENT. 4 YOU DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THAT? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THE PEOPLE IN THE UTILITIES 6 7 PROGRAM KNOW. I'M NOT MARRIED. I DON'T HAVE ANY CHILDREN. I WAS 8. JUST ON A CRIMINAL CASE IN THE SUPERIOR COURT JUST LAST MONTH. 9 SO I'M GETTING HIT AGAIN HERE. AND I UNDERSTAND THE 10 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TRIAL AND .--11 THE COURT: I WAS GOING TO SAY, YOU MUST BE 12 REPORTING EARLY AND OFTEN IF YOU'VE BEEN CALLED FOR BOTH STATE 13 AND FEDERAL SERVICE AT THE SAME TIME. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I CAN BE FAIR. 15 THE COURT: THANK YOU, 16 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS 18 I'M AN INVESTIGATOR AND HOUSING COORDINATOR 19 2.0 MARRIED FOR 12 YEARS. MY HUSBAND IS 21 DON'T HAVE CHILDREN BY CHOICE. I DON'T HAVE ANY EXPERIENCE IN . 22 THE COURT SYSTEM. I CAN BE FAIR. IT WOULD BE AN HONOR, 23 24 SIR. THE COURT: THANK YOU. I APPRECIATE YOUR ANSWERS. 25

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

. ...

#### Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 56 of 69 55 HE HAS BEEN UNFORTUNATELY, MY OTHER SON HAS . 1 FOR SEVERAL YEARS. I'VE HAD EXPERIENCE ON ONE 2 IT WAS A CRIMINAL CASE AT THE VISTA COURTHOUSE. AND I 3 TRIAL. CERTAINLY CAN BE FAIR. THANK YOU. THE COURT: 5 GOOD AFTERNOON. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS 7 CHILDREN. I HAVE I'M MARRIED. 8 MY WIFE IS A SECTION 9 MY SON IS A 10 I'M A CONTRACT OFFICER FOR THE NAVY WORKING AT THE 11 AND I'VE BEEN CALLED 12 THREE TIMES. I'VE NEVER BEEN IMPANELED ON A JURY. I'VE 13 STATED MY PRO POLICE VIEWS. 14 THE COURT: YOU CAN SERVE IN THIS FUNCTION AS A 15 GRAND JUROR OBJECTIVELY, LOOK AT THE EVIDENCE, AND ANSWER THE 16 QUESTIONS THAT I'VE REPEATED NOW SEVERAL TIMES: DO I HAVE A 17 REASONABLE BELIEF THAT A CRIME WAS COMMITTED? DO I HAVE A 18 REASONABLE BELIEF THAT THE PERSON THEY WANT ME TO INDICT 19 EITHER COMMITTED THE CRIME OR ASSISTED WITH IT? .20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES, SIR. 21 THE COURT: THANK YOU, 22 23 I LIVE IN PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 24 25

Filed 07/30/2007 Page 57 of 69 Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 56 "THE COURT: HOW IS THAT? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I LOVE BEING I WOULD 2 HAVE WALKED TODAY, EXCEPT I THINK IT'S GOING TO RAIN. 3 I'M A CPA. I'M MARRIED. NO CHILDREN. AND I HAVE NEVER SERVED ON A JURY. AND I CAN BE FAIR. 5 THANK YOU THE COURT: 6 7 4.0 I LIVE IN PROSPECTIVE JUROR: ~8 I DO NOT WORK. I'VE BEEN MARRIED FOR 9 MY HUSBAND IS RETIRED FROM THE 10 BUT NOW IS A 11. 12 THE COURT: WHAT WAS HIS JOB WITH THE 13 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: HE WAS A ..15 BUT ALWAYS WORKED IN 16 17 WHAT DOES HE DO NOW AS A THE COURT: 18 19 EMPLOYEE: PROSPECTIVE JUROR: HE'S A 20 AND THEN, FOR EXAMPLE, HE'LL WORKS IN 21 BE WORKING AT THE 22 THE COURT: LET'S HOPE THEY WIN THAT GAME. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES. 24 THE COURT: I'M A LITTLE WORRIED ABOUT IT. I WAS 25

TORN WITH THE KANSAS CITY CHIEFS. I WAS HOPING -- I THOUGHT THEY WOULD BE THE EASIER TEAM FOR THE CHARGERS TO BEAT.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: WE HAVE ADULT AND
GRANDCHILDREN. OUR IS A AND
FOR
OUR Y IS A FOR
COMPANY IN I'VE BEEN CALLED, BUT NEVER

THE COURT: YOU SAY THAT MINDFUL OF EVERYTHING YOU LEARNED ON THE TAPE AND ALL THE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS THAT

YES, I COULD BE FAIR.

11 HAVE BEEN GIVEN SQ FAR?

SERVED ON A JURY.

1

2

3

4

. 6

7

8

.9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17.

. 18.

.19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES.

THE COURT:

FROM GILLETTE STADIUM.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS I LIVE

IN THE I'M UNEMPLOYED AT THE CURRENT

TIME. I'M A HOUSEWIFE. I WAS A BOOKKEEPER FOR SEVERAL YEARS.

I'VE BEEN MARRIED FOR 19. MY SPOUSE IS A

WE HAVE ADULT BOTH WHO LIVE IN

ONE WORKS IN THE OTHER

THINK I WAS CALLED FOR TRIAL JURY OVER AT SUPERIOR COURT ABOUT

15 YEARS AGO, BUT I DON'T REMEMBER -- I DON'T THINK I WAS

IMPANELED, AT LEAST NOT THAT I REMEMBER. I LIKE THINGS TO

BALANCE OUT. I LIKE TO FIND HOW THINGS WORK. THAT'S WHY I

ENJOY WORKING WITH NUMBERS. I GREW UP ABOUT 20 MINUTES AWAY

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

Ca	ise 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 60 of 69
	. 59
1	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
2	
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS
. 4	I LIVE WORK AT A CHILDREN'S BOOK STORE IN
5	I'M MARRIED. MY HUSBAND WORKS
6	ADULT CHILDREN, MY OLDEST GRADUATED FROM
. 7	A HE'S A
. 8	MY SECOND GRADUATED FROM HE'S
9	AN LIVE BEEN CALLED TO JURY DUTY, BUT
10	NEVER IMPANELED. I CAN BE FAIR.
11	THE COURT: LET ME TEST MY MEMORY WITH YOU.
12	"WHERE THE WILD THINGS ARE."
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
14	THE COURT: IS THAT BOOK STILL VERY POPULAR?
1,5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: VERY. I CAN'T KEEP IT ON THE
16	SHELF. THAT'S WHAT EVERYBODY WANTS FOR A BABY GIFT.
17	THE COURT: DO YOU USE THAT BOOK WITH
. 18	YOUR BOYS?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES.
20.	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
21	
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS
23	IN A TEACHER AND A COACH
24	FOR ADOLESCENT KIDS; HEALTH, P.E., LA CROSSE. I'M MARRIED.
25	MY SPOUSE IS HE'S GONE BACK TO
. 20	

Ç	ase 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 61 of 69
	60
	SCHOOL. HE TINKERS IN THE TOON'T HAVE ADULT
1	
2	CHILDREN. I HAVE HAD EXPERIENCE IN CRIMINAL AND CIVIL CASES.
3	THE COURT: HOW MUCH EXPERIENCE? YOU'VE SAT ON BOTH
4	CRIMINAL AND CIVIL JURIES?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES, SIR.
. 6	THE COURT: WHEN WAS YOUR MOST RECENT JURY
7	EXPERIENCE?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: APPROXIMATELY FIVE YEARS AGO, A
9	CIVIL CASE.
10	THE COURT: LET ME PUT TO YOU THE QUESTION THAT I
11	PUT TO MANY WHO'VE HAD BOTH TYPES OF JURY EXPERIENCE.
12	YOU UNDERSTAND THE DISTINCTION HERE THAT THIS GRAND
13	JURY WOULD PERFORM A DIFFERENT FUNCTION FROM THE ONE
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I UNDERSTAND THAT.
15	THE COURT: AND
16	YOUR LAST ANSWER.
17	YOU CAN BE FAIR?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I CAN BE FAIR.
19	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
20	the Alley
. 21	PROSPECTÎVE JUROR: MY NAME IS J
22	IN A CATHOLIC DEACON AT A CHURCH
.· 23	AND I'M ALSO PRESIDENT OF A COMPANY IN
24	MAKES FOR FOR I VE BEEN MARRIED FOR
25	YEARS. MY WIFE IS A HARMAN AND SHE
,	

. . 1.

√.6

.9

2.5

WORK. I HAVE ADULT CHILDREN AND TWO GRANDCHILDREN. MY

IS A FOR THE MY

AT

DOES ON AT

AT

AS WE DISCUSSED

TEN YEARS AGO, I WAS A JUROR ON A CIVIL CASE. AND I HAVE TO

SAY I'M SOFT ON IMMIGRATION BECAUSE I'VE DONE VOLUNTEER WORK

WITH IMMIGRANTS IN THE FIELD. BUT I DO NOT THINK THAT WOULD

STAND IN MY WAY OF MAKING FAIR AND OBJECTIVE DECISIONS.

THE COURT: AS YOU HEARD ME EXPLAIN EARLIER TO ONE
OF THE PROSPECTIVE GRAND JURORS, WE'RE NOT ABOUT TRYING TO
CHANGE PEOPLE'S PHILOSOPHIES OR ATTITUDES HERE. THAT'S NOT MY
BUSINESS. BUT WHAT I HAVE TO INSIST ON IS THAT YOU FOLLOW THE
LAW THAT'S GIVEN TO US BY UNITED STATES CONGRESS. WE ENFORCE
THE FEDERAL LAWS HERE.

I THINK I CONFESSED ALOUD THAT THERE'S SOME OF THE
LAWS THAT I DISAGREE WITH THAT I HAVE TO ENFORCE. SO IT'S NOT
ABOUT ME OR MY PHILOSOPHIES. IT'S ABOUT PERFORMING A
CONSCIENTIOUS FUNCTION HERE AND SEEING IF THE FACTS SUPPORT AN
OUTCOME ONE WAY OR THE OTHER.

CAN YOU DO THAT?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I DON'T THINK I WOULD HAVE ANY PROBLEM.

THE COURT: THANK YOU.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS

# 62 LIVE IN THAVE WORKED AS A CHEMICAL ENGINEER, AS A 1 2 LAWYER, AS A SOCIAL WORKER, AND AS A LAW SCHOOL PROFESSOR. 3 THE COURT: WHAT WAS DISCIPLINE IN THE LAW? WERE YOU AN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAWYER? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: NO. LABOR LAW AND PERSUASIVE 5 6 WRITING AT Y THE COURT: WHEN YOU PRACTICED, WHERE DID YOU 7 8 PRACTICE? \ 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I WAS WITH CORPORATIONS IN NEW YORK; PARTY WHO BUILT THE 10 11 THAT I WAS INVOLVED IN. I WENT FROM THAT TO BUILT THE AND I WENT IN-HOUSE WITH 12 BUT I'VE ALSO BEEN WITH LARGE LAW FIRMS IN 13 14 15 THE COURT: INTERESTING AND VARIED LEGAL CAREER, 16 HUH? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES. I'VE BEEN MARRIED FOR YEARS TWICE AND NOT 18 19 DIVORCED. THAT ALSO ADDS UP TO HAPPY YEARS. WIFE WORKS FOR THE 20 21 INCIDENTALLY, SHE WAS 22 23 24. 25 THE COURT: HER FIRST HUSBAND?

# Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 64 of 69

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: YES.

THE COURT: INTERESTING.

MR. IS TALKING ABOUT THE CASE THAT

PROBABLY ALL OF US KNOW FROM TV, THE MIRANDA DECISION, WHERE

YOU HAVE TO TELL THE SUSPECTS BEFORE YOU QUESTION THEM "YOU

HAVE A RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT. ANYTHING YOU SAY CAN AND WILL

BE HELD AGAINST YOU IN A COURT OF LAW."

HE WAS THE LAWYER FOR ERNESTO MIRANDA, HUH? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THAT WAS AN ACLU CASE.

(FAN) 1888 - Josef Berthall Statement in Bellen Charles

WHEN

THE COURT: HE GOT KILLED IN A BAR F

THE COURT: HE GOT KILLED IN A BAR FIGHT IN PHOENIX YEARS AFTER HE WAS VINDICATED.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THAT'S RIGHT. WHEN THE POLICE

CAME TO ARREST THE SUSPECT, THEY KNEW THEY HAD TO READ

SOMETHING TO HIM. THEY WEREN'T SURE WHAT. AND THE OTHER

POLICEMAN WHO WAS LOOKING THROUGH THE VICTIM'S -- MIRANDA'S

WALLET SAID, "LOOK HERE. I FOUND SOMETHING. I THINK THIS IS

IT." SO THE GUY WHO KILLED MIRANDA WAS READ HIS MIRANDA

RIGHTS FROM WHAT WAS IN MIRANDA'S WALLET.

THE COURT: AMONG THE MEMORABILIA THAT

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I DIDN'T GO THROUGH IT. IT WAS BOXES AND BOXES OF PAPERS.

THE COURT: I WOULD IMAGINE IN THIS DAY, THAT WOULD

2.2

BE SÖMETHING THAT COULD FETCH MONEY ON EBAY.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THAT WAS PRE-EBAY.

I HAD NATURAL CHILDREN, TWO OF WHOM ARE ALIVE.

64

ONE IS A AND THE OTHER HAS A ONE OF MY CHILDREN WHO DIED WAS A LITIGATION ATTORNEY IN STEPCHILDREN. ONE IS A CRIMINAL DEFENSE LAWYER IN COUNTY, AND THE OTHER IS AN I WAS SEATED AS A CRIMINAL JUROR IN SUPERIOR

COURT. WE ACQUITTED. AND I CERTAINLY CAN BE FAIR.

THE COURT: THANK YOU, I APPRECIATE YOUR ANSWERS.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

. 22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

20 AS FAR AS MY LIVING, I'M AN ARCHITECT.

.21 I'M WE SPECIALIZE IN

GENERALLY MORE TOWARDS INSTITUTIONAL WORK. WE DO

23 LIBRARIES FOR THE CITY OF AND

24 HAVE EXPERIENCE IN TERMS OF TRIAL, BUT IT'S

25 LIMITED TO EXPERT WITNESS PRIMARILY ON ZONING ISSUES AND

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

# Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 66 of 69 65 CONSTRUCTION DEFECT. I'VE PROBABLY BEEN INVOLVED IN SOMEWHERE 1 BETWEEN 13 AND 15 OF THOSE KINDS OF CASES. YOUR HONOR, I WILL 2 3 BE FAIR. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, 5 APPRECIATE YOUR ANSWERS. 6 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MY NAME IS 8 I'M A REALTOR, AND MY HUSBAND IS A WE HAVE ONE WHO IS I HAVE HAD. 9. NO EXPERIENCE WITH BEING A JUROR. I CAN BE FAIR. 10 THE COURT: THANK YOU, 11 ONCE AGAIN, I HAVE TO MAKE A DETERMINATION HERE OF 12 WHO MIGHT BE THE FOREPERSON AND DEPUTY FOREPERSON. 13 14

TASK OF SERVING AS THE FOREPERSON? LET ME TELL YOU ABOUT THE ROLE OF A FOREPERSON.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I HAD

AGO. I'M DOING FINE, BUT SOME DAYS --

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

· 25

THE COURT: I'M GOING TO APPOINT A DEPUTY FOREPERSON, TOO. LET ME TELL YOU WHAT THE FUNCTION IS.

IT USED TO BE WHEN THE GRAND JURY DECIDED ON A GROUP OF CASES AND DECIDED TO RETURN INDICTMENTS IN CASES, THE ENTIRE GRAND JURY WOULD HAVE TO COME DOWN AND AFFIRM THAT "THESE ARE OUR DECISIONS." A FEW YEARS AGO, FIVE, SIX, SEVEN YEARS AGO, CONGRESS PASSED A LAW THAT SAID, "WE'LL ALLOW THE

FOREPERSON OF THE GRAND JURY TO COME DOWN AND REPRESENT TO THE COURT THE RESULTS OF GRAND JURY BALLOTING"

SO TYPICALLY, AS YOU HEARD ME MENTION, ONCE THE GRAND JURY SESSION IS THROUGH FOR THE DAY, THE GRAND JURY FOREPERSON OR DEPUTY FOREPERSON WILL COME DOWN AND ATTEST TO THE COURT ALONG WITH THE APPROPRIATE PAPERWORK THE RESULTS OF GRAND JURY'S WORK FOR THE DAY. THAT WOULD BE ABOUT IT.

THE OTHER THING IS THE U.S. ATTORNEY WOULD LOOK TO YOU TO HELP SCHEDULE SESSIONS WITH THE GRAND JURY, TO GET A CONSENSUS AMONG GRAND JURORS ABOUT BREAKS OR HOW LONG YOU WANT TO GO, THAT TYPE OF THING. I DON'T WANT TO SAY IT'S NOT IMPORTANT, BUT IT'S NOT GOING TO TAX YOUR RESOURCES MUCH MORE, I DON'T THINK, THAN JUST SIMPLY SERVING AS A GRAND JUROR. THERE IS A LITTLE MORE INVOLVED, AND YOU HAVE A TITLE.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'D RATHER BE THE DEPUTY.

THE COURT: WELL, THEN, LET'S SWITCH PLACES.

I WAS GOING TO CALL UPON YOU TO SEE IF
YOU'D BE INTERESTED IN BEING A DEPUTY.

DEFER TO YOU AS THE FOREPERSON.

ARE YOU WILLING TO TAKE THAT ASSIGNMENT?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I WOULD BE.

OF THE GRAND JURY AND AS THE DEPUTY FOREPERSON.

NOW, I MENTIONED THE POSSIBILITY THAT THERE MIGHT BE PEOPLE THAT WANTED TO SWITCH BETWEEN THURSDAY AND FRIDAY

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

<14

Case 3:07-cr-00491-BTM Document 18 Filed 07/30/2007 Page 68 of 69 67 PANELS. I'VE BEEN INFORMED THAT ONE OF THE GRAND JURORS FROM 1 THE FIRST PANEL, THE WEDNESDAY PANEL, WOULD PREFER TO SIT ON 2 THURSDAYS. 3 IS THERE ANYONE ON THIS THURSDAY PANEL -- OKAY. RIGHT. LET ME TAKE FIRST THINGS FIRST. 6 TURNING MY ATTENTION BACK TO THE WEDNESDAY PANEL, 7 WHO IS IT THAT WOULD PREFER --8 I'M GOING TO TRY TO GET YOU, IN ORDER. SPOKE UP FIRST. 10 11 LET ME SEE IF I HAVE FOUR SIMILARLY SITUATED PEOPLE 12 ON THURSDAY THAT WANT TO GO TO WEDNESDAY. 13 MR. COOPER, I'M GOING TO SWITCH YOU WITH 14 15 , I'LL SWITCH YOU WITH 16 I'LL SWITCH YOU WIT 17 I'LL SWITCH YOU WITH 18 19 IS THERE ANYONE ELSE WHO EITHER WANTS TO SWITCH OR 20 IS INDIFFERENT? 21 I'LL SWITCH YOU WITH 22 I LIKE TO BE ACCOMMODATING TO EVERYBODY. AND SEEING 23 NO MORE HANDS, I'M NOT GOING TO MAKE ANY MORE INQUIRIES. 24 WILL YOU STAND. 25

